# CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Special Meeting Notice 

Date: Wednesday, September 7, 2016; 6:00 p.m.<br>Location: Transportation Authority Hearing Room, 1455 Market Street, Floor 22<br>Members: Chris Waddling (Chair), Peter Sachs (Vice Chair), Myla Ablog, Becky Hogue, Brian Larkin, John Larson, Jacqualine Sachs, Peter Tannen and Bradley Wiedmaier

(00 1. Page
6:00 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order
6:05 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION
6:10 Consent Calendar
3. Approve the Minutes of the June 22, 2016 Meeting and July 11, 2016 Special Meeting - ACTION*
4. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments - INFORMATION

The Plans and Programs Committee will consider recommending appointment of two members to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) at its September 20 meeting. The vacancies are the result of the resignation of John Morrison (District 11 resident) due to health and time constraints, and the automatic membership termination of Santiago Lerma (District 9 resident) due to four absences over twelve regularly scheduled consecutive meetings, pursuant to the CAC's By-Laws. Mr. Lerma is seeking reappointment. Neither staff nor CAC members make recommendations regarding CAC appointments. CAC applications can be submitted through the Transportation Authority's website at www.sfcta.org/cac.
5. Investment Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2016 - INFORMATION*

The Transportation Authority's Investment Policy directs that a review of portfolio compliance be presented quarterly. As year-end closing is just wrapping up, the investment report for the quarter ended June 30, 2016 is presented independently. Following the annual audit, the Basic Financial Statements will be presented to the Citizens Advisory Committee along with the results of the fiscal audit, single audit, and management review.

## End of Consent Calendar

6. Major Capital Projects Update - Transbay Transit Center and Downtown Rail Extension - INFORMATION*

The Transbay Transit Center and Downtown Extension (TTC/DTX) project, one of the signature Prop K projects, is being built in two phases: Phase 1 is the TTC building, bus ramp, and related improvements, and Phase 2 is the downtown extension of commuter rail service into the new TTC, accommodating both Caltrain and high-speed trains. On June 9, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) Board adopted the final revised budget for Phase 1 in the amount of $\$ 2.3$ billion. At that same meeting, staff presented a comprehensive Phase 2 update with a refreshed cost estimate. The TJPA Board directed staff to proceed with the work required to advance Phase 2 (see separate agenda item requesting Prop K funds). The 1.95mile rail extension will be constructed principally below grade using cut-and-cover and mined tunneling methods underneath Townsend and Second Streets. The design includes a new underground station at Fourth and Townsend Streets and six structures for emergency egress and ventilation along the alignment.

The current estimate for Phase 2 (DTX) is $\$ 3.9$ billion. There is an aspirational open-for-use date of 2025 , which is predicated on securing funding in a timely manner and a construction period of seven years, starting in December 2018. The proposed funding plan includes Passenger Facility Charges that are subject to approval by the California High-Speed Rail Authority and Caltrain boards. Construction of Phase 1, the TTC, is well underway. As of the end of July, Phase 1 was $65 \%$ complete. Although at one time it appeared that completion was going to be three months late, the contractor has been successful in its recovery efforts and it now looks like construction will reach substantial completion on schedule and within budget. TJPA has started planning for the facility's commissioning, with bus service scheduled to begin in December 2017.

6:45 7. Adopt a Motion of Support for Amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan and the Guideways - Muni 5-Year Prioritization Program - ACTION*

The Prop K Expenditure Plan requires development of a Strategic Plan to guide the financial implementation of the program, and development of a 5 -Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) for each of the 21 programmatic categories as a prerequisite for allocation of funds. The purpose of the 5 YPPs is to provide transparency in how sponsors prioritize projects for Prop K funding, to establish a pipeline of projects that are ready to advance as soon as Prop K and other funds are available, and to encourage coordination across Prop K programs. In the summer of 2014, the Transportation Authority Board approved the Prop K 5YPPs for the 21 programmatic categories, including the Guideways - Muni category, for the period covering Fiscal Years (FY) 2014/15-2018/19. As approved the 5YPP included two projects with about $\$ 12$ million in Prop K funds and programmed $\$ 17$ million to a series of placeholders for yet-to-be-identified projects. The SFMTA has recently updated its Capital Improvement Program and has identified several guideways projects that are ready to advance during this 5YPP period. To make sufficient Prop K funds available, the SFMTA has requested a comprehensive amendment to the Guideways - Muni 5YPP and a corresponding Prop K Strategic Plan amendment to advance $\$ 5,898$,500 in Prop K funds from FY 2033/34 to FY 2016/17, as well as reprogram $\$ 6.1$ million in FY 2018/19 Prop K funds from the New Backup Vehicle Control Center which is not going to advance in the next three years, to the priority projects shown in Attachment 2. The amendment would result in a minor $1.84 \%$ increase in financing costs in the Guideways - Muni category over the 30 -year life of the Prop K Expenditure Plan.
7:00 8. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of $\$ 20,888,900$ in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Fourteen Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules - ACTION*

As summarized in Attachments 1 and 2, we have fourteen requests totaling $\$ 20,888,900$ in Prop K funds to present to the Citizens Advisory Committee. The Transbay Joint Powers Authority has requested $\$ 6.8$ million for preliminary engineering and cost estimate updates for the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX), a 1.3 mile tunnel connecting the new Transbay Transit Center with the current Caltrain terminus at Fourth and King Streets. The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain) has requested $\$ 3.9$ million for Electrification and $\$ 140,000$ for Communication Based Overlay System/Positive Train Control. Caltrain has also requested $\$ 5$ million in Prop K funds for San Francisco's Fiscal Year (FY) 2016/17 member contribution to the Caltrain capital budget for state of good repair projects, including the construction phase for retrofitting or replacing structural elements of the Marin and Napoleon Street bridges, mid-life overhauls for a small fleet of diesel locomotives that will be used post-electrification, and restroom renovations at the $4^{\text {th }}$ and King station. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency has requested funds for five projects: replacement of the overhead contact system (OCS) for the 33-Stanyan trolleybus line on $18^{\text {th }}$ Street between Castro and Mission ( $\$ 1.4$ million); traffic signal upgrades at five intersections to facilitate the conversion of portions of Eddy and Ellis Streets to two-way operation $(\$ 310,000)$; implementation of traffic calming measures from four areawide traffic calming plans ( $\$ 1.5$ million); and installation of flashing beacons at seven intersections on WalkFirst high-injury corridors $(\$ 399,000)$. Approval of the requests for DTX, Electrification, and the Caltrain capital budget require amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan to advance funds to FY 2016/17. Approval of the 33-Stanyan OCS project is contingent upon approval of a 5-Year Prioritization Program and corresponding Prop K Strategic Plan amendment for the Muni Guideways category presented in the previous item on this agenda.

## 9. Plan Bay Area 2040 Revised List of Project Priorities - INFORMATION

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) are currently developing Plan Bay Area 2040 (PBA 2040), the Bay Area's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy that adopts a land use vision and a transportation system to govern the region's growth and investment through 2040. In October 2015, the Transportation Authority adopted
goals and objectives for our participation in the PBA 2040 process and approved a list of projects and programs for MTC and ABAG to consider for inclusion in PBA 2040. We have subsequently provided updates to the CAC on PBA goals, the results of PBA project performance evaluation, ABAG's draft growth scenarios and more. By September 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, the regional agencies are expected to release the draft staff preferred scenario, which includes a projected pattern of household and employment growth (land use) in the Bay Area through 2040 and a coordinated transportation investment strategy. At the September $7^{\text {th }}$ Special CAC meeting, we will provide an initial set of reactions on the draft preferred scenario, focusing on the transportation investment strategy. MTC/ABAG anticipate adopting the Final Preferred Scenario in November 2016 and Plan Bay Area 2040 in late summer or early fall of 2017.

## 7:45 10. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

During this segment of the meeting, CAC members may make comments on items not specifically listed above, or introduce or request items for future consideration.
7:50 11. Public Comment
8:00 12. Adjournment

* Additional materials


## Next Meeting: September 28, 2016

## CAC MEMBERS WHO ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND SHOULD CONTACT THE CLERK AT (415) 522-4817

The Hearing Room at the Transportation Authority is wheelchair accessible. To request sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Clerk of the Authority at (415) 522-4800. Requests made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability.

The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Grove/Hyde Streets). Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center or Van Ness Stations). MUNI bus lines also serving the area are the $6,7,9,9 R, 14,14 R, 21$, 47, 49, and 90. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 701-4485.

There is accessible parking in the vicinity of City Hall at Civic Center Plaza and adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex. Accessible curbside parking is available on $11^{\text {th }}$ Street.

In order to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at all public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the Transportation Authority accommodate these individuals.

If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Citizens Advisory Committee after distribution of the meeting packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Transportation Authority at 1455 Market Street, Floor 22, San Francisco, CA 94103, during normal office hours.

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign \& Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100; fax (415) 252-3112; website www.sfethics.org.
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## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 22, 2016

## 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Chris Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.
CAC members present were Chris Waddling (Chair), Peter Sachs (Vice Chair), Becky Hogue, John Larson, Jacqualine Sachs (entered during Item 6) and Bradley Wiedmaier.

Transportation Authority staff members present were Colin Dentel-Post, Cynthia Fong, Rachel Hiatt, Jeff Hobson, Seon Joo Kim, Anna LaForte, Maria Lombardo, Mike Pickford, Steve Rehn and Michael Schwartz.

## 2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Waddling said that there would be two CAC appointments on the agenda of the July 19 Plans and Programs Committee meeting, and that Brian Larkin would be seeking reinstatement. He also said that due to the Board of Supervisors' August recess, the next scheduled meeting of the CAC would be Wednesday, September 7.

## Consent Calendar

3. Approve the Minutes of the May 25, 2016 Meeting and June 15, 2016 Special Meeting ACTION
4. State and Federal Legislative Update - INFORMATION*
5. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments - INFORMATION

There was no public comment on the Consent Calendar.
Becky Hogue moved to approve the Consent Calendar, seconded by Peter Sachs.
The Consent Calendar was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larson, P. Sachs, Waddling and Wiedmaier
Absent: CAC Members Ablog, Lerma, J. Sachs and Tannen

## End of Consent Calendar

6. Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of $\$ 45,417,062$ in Prop K Funds and $\$ 141,794$ in Prop AA Funds, with Conditions, for Eleven Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules, and a Commitment to Allocate \$3,810,006 in Prop K funds - ACTION
Anna LaForte, Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Peter Sachs asked about the costs and benefits of constructing parking lots near the South Ocean Beach Multi-Use Trail given erosion issues. Oscar Gee with San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) replied that currently only the parking lot at the north end of the project area
was affected by erosion and would not be replaced. Brian Stokle with San Francisco Department of Recreation and Parks said the parking lot at the south end would be added at some point in the future. Mr. Stokle further explained that the proposed middle lot would be added in Phase 1 (the current request), noting that SFPW had to balance the issue of coastal erosion with the public's desire for access to the beach as evidenced by a substantial amount of informal parking in undesignated areas. Mr. Sachs asked how long the middle parking lot would be sustained due to ongoing erosion. Mr. Stokle said that this proposed lot would be placed where the roadway currently was located, but that SFPW did not currently know how long it would be in place.

John Larson asked if there was a timeframe for Phase 2 modifications and an end date. Mr. Gee replied that SFPW anticipated the project would be completed by 2021.
Chair Waddling asked what the purpose of narrowing was if it would divert drivers to other nearby routes, as well as which streets would be affected. Mr. Gee replied that drivers would likely be rerouted, but that retreat from the erosion was the main purpose. Mr. Sachs expressed concern that congestion was likely during Phases 1 and 2, and that it would shift to other streets in the neighborhood. He also expressed general concern about unintended congestion impacts and the lack of funds set aside to mitigate them. Mr. Gee responded that a SPUR 2010 transportation study indicated that narrowing would cause minimal traffic impact, as Sloat Boulevard and Skyline Street would provide route options. He said before implementing a full closure, all the coordinating agencies would have an opportunity to evaluate the impact as part of a larger traffic impact analysis.

Mr. Gee said he could provide SPUR's 2010 transportation study and did not know if it was referred to in the Master Plan. Tim Dougherty with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) confirmed the transportation study was included in SPUR's Ocean Beach Master Plan and that long-term transportation impacts from the project would be evaluated under the California Environmental Quality Act process.

Mr. Larson asked about the status of $\$ 61$ million in funds from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) for Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements. Kamini Lall with the SFMTA replied that the SFPUC and SFMTA were still holding discussions and said it should be known in the next few days if and how much it would be.

Mr. Sachs asked if the bus bridge needed during the Twin Peaks tunnel work could skip Forest Hill station on some trips to save time on a very circuitous route. Ms. LaForte said that staff would pass along the suggestion.
With respect to the Van Ness Avenue BRT project, Mr. Wiedmaier asked if the stop at McAllister Street would receive special treatment due to its historical status. Ms. Lall replied that she did not know, but that organizations specializing in historical preservation were being consulted. Mr. Wiedmaier said that the current design, especially the bulky handrails and railings, seemed contemporary and did not match the historic landmark. Ms. Lall said she would confirm if those designs were final or if there were differing designs for the McAllister stop.

With respect to the Bicycle Facility Maintenance project, Mr. Waddling said that in some of the locations where pavement markings would be repainted, such as the Wiggle, the pavement was in poor condition and it did not make sense to paint over it before it was repaired. He also said there was a citywide problem with poor pavement in bicycle lanes, forcing bicyclists to dangerously use the part of the road designated for motor vehicles to avoid rough pavement. He noted John Muir Drive as a prime example of the situation.

Rachel Alonso with SFPW said she was surprised that bike lane pavement was worse than that
for vehicle lanes, since damage should be worse from heavier vehicles, and that pavement renovation renewed the entire road surface from curb to curb. She noted that SFPW had a 5 Year Paving Plan and that SFPW and the utilities had been trying to improve coordination efforts to deliver repairs through a single contract for all needed improvements in a given street segment, but did not know how bicycle lanes were selected for repainting. Craig Raphael with the SFMTA said the SFMTA administers spot treatments to transit lanes before red painting if a full pavement renovation was not scheduled soon. He said he would follow up on the bike painting issue to see what was done when the painting and paving schedules were not in sync.

During public comment, Alice Rogers with the South Park Improvement Association said the South Park neighborhood had often been perceived as a different kind of neighborhood than it really was. She continued saying that it was often thought of as a place with lots of technology workers during the day, but she pointed out that the area included "under the radar" uses such as Single Room Occupancy units with many disabled tenants, as well as a Filipino senior center She said she wanted to make sure the traffic calming would improve safety and was not just cosmetic.

Chair Waddling thanked Ms. Rogers for coming to the meeting to represent folks who couldn't easily attend themselves. He asked if staff could provide their contact information for the public to seek traffic calming improvements. Chad Rathmann with the SFMTA provided the website where members of the public could request traffic calming improvements. [https://www.sfmta.com/calming.]

Tim Dougherty with the SFMTA said the Planning Department was leading an update on the local coastal plan, which was an element of the City's General Plan. He offered to provide a link to the CAC, noting that the update incorporated some of the new policies that were discussed as part of the South Ocean Beach Multi-Use Trail project.

Jacqualine Sachs said she wanted the SFMTA to evaluate the 66 -line and consider reverting back to the route as it was prior to 2002. She said a lot of seniors and people with disabilities used it, and that the 66 -line buses typically lay over at $9^{\text {th }}$ and Judah Streets before turning around.

Mr. Sachs said it was important not to generalize about neighborhood populations and voiced support for the proposed study to improve the route's effectiveness.
Mr. Wiedmaier asked if the unusual, high curbstones at South Park would be left undisturbed in order to preserve its character. Marien Coss with the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department confirmed that the higher curbs would be retained and that the park would be fully accessible, with an accessible pass through the park. Ms. Rogers added that South Park had gone through a historical review which concluded that the curbstones were not historic.

John Larson moved to approve the item, seconded by Becky Hogue.
The item was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larson, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Waddling and Wiedmaier
Absent: CAC Members Ablog, Lerma and Tannen

## 7. Development of a Potential Local Transportation Revenue Measure and Expenditure Plan - INFORMATION

Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director for Policy and Programming, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Mr. Sachs said he read the minutes from the June 15, 2016 CAC Special Meeting and agreed with Peter Tannen's comments and noted he was not a fan of earmarking things in a budget without guaranteeing funds. For that reason, he said he was more a fan of the back-up plan. With respect to the charter amendment, he commented that it set up administration of transportation programs under three different agencies and noted that this raised concern about miscommunication, duplication of effort, etc. and that he would prefer to have the Transportation Authority or another agency administer all the programs.
Responding to the comment about budget set asides, Ms. Lombardo noted that the Board of Supervisors (BOS) had introduced a $0.75 \%$ general sales tax measure, that if approved, would provide enough revenue to cover the increased expenditures that would be created through the charter amendment. She continued to note that the charter amendment contained a provision that allowed the Mayor to terminate the charter amendment by January 1, 2017 if general fund revenue projections did not look sufficient to pay for the set asides, e.g. such as if the general sales tax did not pass. Mr. Sachs noted that this was confusing for voters who had to make the connection between the two measures, especially with many other items on the ballot. Ms. Lombardo acknowledged his point, noting that in the June election, Solano County voters approved a policy advisory measure that outlined a spending plan, but failed to approve the related general sales tax.
Ms. Lombardo said the proposed administrative split was the result of negotiations, and that coordination happened on most projects of medium to large size, as they tended to have multiple funding sources. She also noted that the transportation sales tax expenditure plan required that the 5 -year prioritization programs go through the City's Capital Planning Committee for input prior to adoption as an effort to further improve coordination.
Ms. Sachs said she had worked on Prop B in 1989 among other transportation-related efforts. She attended the Policy and Programs Committee Meeting on June 21, 2016 and said that she disagreed with a new tax measure and that the SFMTA should use the funds they currently receive. She stated that Prop K should be extended before pushing this additional revenue measure, and did not think the public will support this new measure.

Mr. Larson also agreed with Peter Sachs and Peter Tannen in that ballot box budgeting was bad public policy. He said that for example, in the past voters approved parking garages for museums but did not approve of supporting the museums. He asked if the termination clause were exercised, was there a plan to go back for funding. Ms. Lombardo said that like many other jurisdictions the city would need to try again.

Mr. Sachs said the City was mismanaging funds for homelessness and that the public was not getting their money's worth. He said he was concerned that the bundled measure proposed by City Hall which combined transportation and homelessness could result in transportation not getting funded.
There was no public comment.

## 8. Adopt a Motion of Support to Adopt the San Francisco Parking Supply and Utilization Study Summary Report - ACTION

Michael Schwartz, Principal Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
Ms. Sachs said she did not understand why the City would not let the Pacific Dental School students and faculty use a nearby garage when it wanted to move locations. Mr. Schwartz said the study did not look at specific cases like that, but rather tried to evaluate available spaces in order to manage supply. Ms. Sachs said she observed underutilized parking lots throughout the City.

Mr. Wiedmaier said the study looked only at parking, which was not as effective as cordon pricing, and asked why the study did not consider the effect of both. He also asked is there would be a study that addressed the congestion impact of ride hailing services, especially during the peak times of Friday and Saturday nights. Mr. Schwartz said the study did not look into cumulative effects because there was not a preferred parking management approach. Mr. Schwartz said the Transportation Authority, as the Congestion Management Agency for San Francisco, was interested in understanding the effects of ride hailing services on congestion. For that reason, he said that staff was starting a project to look at technology-enabled transportation, and overcoming the challenge of a lack of data to draw definitive conclusions around the effect of services like ride hailing.

Ms. Hogue asked if the Transportation Authority was looking at Treasure Island as an example to be used elsewhere. She said Treasure Island residents did not think they should be charged to use City streets. Mr. Schwartz replied that it would be a demonstration and that agencies would learn from the results of that effort. Mr. Schwartz noted that congestion pricing would require new state legislation as one of a number of approvals before it could be implemented.

There was no public comment.
Peter Sachs moved to approve the item, seconded by Jacqualine Sachs.
The item was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Hogue, Larson, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Waddling and Wiedmaier
Absent: CAC Members Ablog, Lerma and Tannen

## 9. Update on the I-80/Yerba Buena Island East Side Ramps Project - INFORMATION

Eric Cordoba, Deputy Director for Capital Projects, presented the item per the staff memorandum.

Becky Hogue asked if there would be any traffic circulation conflicts during the demolition and if there would be public education for residents, who were especially affected by the project. Mr. Cordoba replied that the demolition was underway and weekly coordinating meetings were being held to minimize traffic circulation conflicts and added that there would be public education.

Mr. Larson congratulated the Transportation Authority for being under budget. Mr. Cordoba credited the engineering staff for managing changes very well.

Mr. Wiedmaier asked if native plants that could tolerate roadside conditions would be used in the landscaping on Yerba Buena Island. Mr. Cordoba said that the Transportation was working with San Francisco Environment, which helped to develop the habitat plan. He said that trees would be planted over several years, but not at this time due to visibility needs of the U.S. Coast Guard.

There was no public comment.

## 10. Update on Late Night Transportation Plan - INFORMATION

Colin Dentel-Post, Senior Planner, presented the item per the staff memorandum.
Ms. Sachs asked if there would be more Late Night Working Group meetings. Mr. Dentel-Post replied that there would be, and that the next was scheduled for August 10.

Mr. Sachs asked if all rotating shifts to San Francisco International Airport were captured, and noted that the presentation appeared to show high demand there. He stated that even if there were low trip numbers, there could be room for improvement because late night BART service
was very poor. Mr. Dentel-Post said he agreed.
Mr. Larson asked if businesses were interested in expanding late night work shifts. He said he was interested in whether expanded service would meet existing demand or if increased service would create demand and increase the number of graveyard shifts. Mr. Dentel-Post replied that currently, businesses found it challenging to staff shifts because people could not access the job sites due to transportation constraints. He stated that he did not know what the effect would be.

Ms. Sachs asked if the 2002 schedules were considered and if technology companies were still taking people home on their own buses. She added that a lot of restaurant workers were affected. Mr. Dentel-Post replied that he was aware of service cuts in 2009 but said there have been substantial changes since the late night roll out in 2006 and a fresh evaluation was desired. He also said that there was not much data on the frequency and capacity of technology company bus rides.
There was no public comment.

## 11. Introduction of New Business - INFORMATION

Mr. Sachs stated the red bus lines on Mission Street have created new problems that he would like evaluated. He stated that the bus lines took away right turn lanes, which forced automobile drivers to use the bus lane in order to turn right. He stated that this had created delays at intersections for both pedestrians and \#14 buses - which sometimes must wait two light signals to get through the intersection at the far stop.

Ms. Sachs stated that she went to the SPUR meeting and that Lower Stockton was not on the agenda. She said that she was in favor of a Special CAC meeting to discuss likely amendments to the potential new revenue measure.

## 12. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

## 13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

# CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE 

Monday, July 11, 2016 Special Meeting

## 1. Committee Meeting Call to Order

Chair Chris Waddling called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.
CAC members present were Chris Waddling (Chair), Peter Sachs (Vice Chair), Myla Ablog, John Larson, Jacqualine Sachs and Bradley Wiedmaier.

Transportation Authority staff members present were Michelle Beaulieu, Seon Joo Kim, Anna Laforte, Maria Lombardo and Eric Young.
2. Adopt a Motion of Support to Endorse the Proposed San Francisco Transportation Expenditure Plan - INFORMATION/ACTION
Maria Lombardo, Chief Deputy Director, presented the item per the staff memorandum. She acknowledged Monique Webster, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA), who was also available to answer questions.

Chair Waddling asked if the sales tax would continue to move through the legislative process should the Board of Supervisors (BOS) vote on July 19 to put the charter amendment on the ballot. Ms. Lombardo replied that it would not, as only one of the measures would be placed on the ballot. Chair Waddling asked if the decision on which measure would move forward would be made at the July 19 BOS meeting. Ms. Lombardo replied that the deadline to place either measure on the ballot was August 5, so the BOS could make a decision at the July 19 meeting or continue the discussion over the next couple of weeks.
Peter Sachs asked whether there was uncertainty or disagreement among the BOS about which measure to place on the ballot. Ms. Lombardo replied that Supervisor Avalos was one of the initial sponsors of both measures, but that he withdrew his support of the charter amendment pending a withdrawal of Supervisor Farrell's proposal related to the City's ability to clear out homeless encampments with 24 -hours' notice. She said that both the Mayor and several members of the BOS wanted a transportation measure on the ballot, but that there were many other measures, including those related to homelessness, that were also part of the complicated discussions going on as policymakers decide which measures ultimately will make it to the ballot.
Myla Ablog asked how many new jobs would be potentially created through this measure, and stated that a lot of residents in the southeast sector of the city were concerned about a new tax, and that job creation could be a good messaging point. Ms. Lombardo said she would follow up with that information.

John Larson asked for more detail on the charter amendment clause that allowed all of the Muni Fleet, Facilities and Infrastructure Repair and Maintenance funding to be directed to Transit Service and Affordability in down economic years. Ms. Lombardo stated that the current charter amendment language allowed the SFMTA to direct up to $100 \%$ of the Muni capital (fleet, facilities, etc.) category could to the Transit Service and Affordability category in bad economic times to prevent service cuts, while the previous draft capped that amount at $25 \%$. Mr. Larson
asked that in the event the charter amendment passed but the three-quarter sales tax did not, would there be enough funding available in an economic downturn to support transit service. Mr. Larson also asked if the failsafe mechanism whereby the Mayor could retract the charter amendment if the sales tax did not pass was still included in the charter amendment. Ms. Lombardo confirmed that it was.

Chair Waddling stated that the $\$ 100$ million per year would go up with inflation and growth, and said that the percentages of funding was what should be considered by the CAC because of that potential. He asked that in the event of a down economy, and if Muni transit capital funds were to be shifted to operations, was there were a way to recoup funding for that category when the economy rebounded. Ms. Lombardo replied that the charter amendment included a baseline setaside amount which would rise and fall with the discretionary revenues in the General Fund. She said the source of funding in that set-aside was primarily from property taxes, and that the source was less susceptible to economic downturns than a sales tax, and likely wouldn't have the same highs and lows as a sales tax. She added that the Controller felt it would have a similar overall growth rate as the sales tax, but that there was no provision to reset the baseline at a future date.

Mr. Sachs voiced concern about the provision enabling the transfer of capital funds to operations funds in a down economic year, and noted that the City of Chicago had a property tax increase funding a multi-million-dollar capital investment program to address a shortfall for the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA). He said that shortfall occurred because over many years, the CTA kept shifting funds from capital to operations accounts, and that he felt that was a poor budget process policy. He expressed concern over having an explicit mechanism to allow this practice, and to take $\$ 20$ million per year from capital to operations, with no mechanism to shift it back after a few years to make up for the deficit in capital funds. Mr. Sachs also pointed out that under the charter amendment, the SFMTA would administer both of the categories, while in a sales tax the Transportation Authority would act as a check on this potential shifting of funds.

Chair Waddling asked if there were a mechanism to return the money from the service to the capital category. Ms. Lombardo replied that there was no such mechanism, but that the SFMTA had a 'rainy day' fund, and that the diversion would not be permitted to exceed the cost of maintaining existing service. Chair Waddling raised concerns about potentially poor decisionmaking in the future by SFMTA management regarding these funds if there were a change in leadership.

Mr. Larson stated that the current language regarding when this shift of funds could be implemented was vague. He noted that the charter said "should SFMTA be required to make service reductions as part of its budget," but that it was not explicitly tied to a revenue shortfall or some kind of downward trend in the budget. He said this could be open to the perniciousness of the agency and that there should be more specificity.
Mr. Sachs asked if Muni could shift funds from the operations budget into the pension fund, then from capital into operations, should there be a pension fund deficit. Chair Waddling stated that he believed it could be possible but that it was unclear. Ms. Lombardo replied that these were valid points, and that the authors of the amendment were trying to make it simple and flexible enough to work well for 25 years, but with clarity on where the funds were going. She noted that it is very difficult to craft a service cuts trigger and that the proposed language represented a compromise that was necessary to bring along the Transportation Equity and Justice Coalition members, who wanted to protect the City's most vulnerable residents from service cuts. Ms. Lombardo also stated that SFMTA had a huge capital shortfall that was still not covered by the proposed measure, which should provide a counter balance to the shifting of
capital to operating funds. Chair Waddling stated that it would be difficult to try to itemize every item to which money could or could not go in this sort of measure.

Jacqualine Sachs referenced her history working on Propositions B and K. She stated that in Cleveland, 45 years ago, a $1.1 \%$ tax was proposed on a large county where the transit systems were falling apart but that it did not pass. She said they went back to the voters with a $1.1 \%$ tax and at the same time proposed to lower fares, and that this was contrary to what Muni had been doing. She said that within five years the Cleveland system generated $\$ 60$ million and were able to completely rebuild the two rail lines, and given that, San Francisco should be able to complete the Geary Light Rail Transit (LRT) within 20 years. She went on that in Prop B, there was $\$ 100$ million tied to Geary LRT and $\$ 100$ million for Third Street, however in order to get federal funding all of the Geary LRT money was allocated to the Third Street LRT and the Central Subway. Ms. Sachs said she had mentioned this at previous meetings, and that she believed Muni should work within its existing budget. She said that Prop K was going to have to be extended to complete all the Prop K projects, and that she did not believe that San Francisco residents should be taxed again when they have been taxed twice, in addition to fares going up. Ms. Sachs said she would like to see the Prop K projects finished before seeing an additional sales tax, and that in the five-year prioritization program for Prop K, there was money for Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) but none for Geary LRT. She said she does not know how Geary Boulevard could be light rail-ready with the current design, and that she also did not support the green and red lanes being painted across the city. She added that the funding for the painted lanes should go to Geary LRT and to the Late Night Transportation investments and service instead. She said that as a transit-first city, San Francisco should not cater so much to the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, and that there were people who ride the bus all day long outside of commuting hours as well. Ms. Sachs said that the Transit Effectiveness Project reduced service and was a bad idea, and that she believed the city needed to increase, not decrease, transit service. She said residents had been relying on Muni for over a century and that the city should not change the service now. She reiterated that she was against a new sales tax for transportation, and believed that voters wanted to see projects finished before voting on a new measure.

Chair Waddling responded that the 'red carpets' were cheap to implement, and that he had found the carpets to provide valuable transit time-savings. He said that green lanes demarcating bicycle lanes, increased the number of cyclists which took cars off the road and made more room on buses. He noted that the amount of money spent on bike infrastructure overall was miniscule, even compared to the small amount spent on paratransit, and that the city had to use the limited infrastructure space to find the best ways to maximize it. He added that he did not support pitting these various interests against one another, noting that someone on a bike was making a ride better for someone in a car, and that someone in a paratransit bus was making it better for someone on a bike and so on. Chair Waddling also stated that it was important to consider if these new projects were needs rather than just wants. He said he would like reassurance that paying a new sales tax was going to make the transportation system functionally better. He asked if the proposed expenditure plan was the same amount as Prop K, what the Prop K categories were, and how much the new revenues were adding to existing categories, or if they would be funding new projects. He said that knowing how much would go into each Prop K category to help existing projects get completed would be helpful to demonstrate the way this funding would help expedite projects.
Ms. Lombardo responded to Ms. Ablog's earlier question about job creation by citing the American Public Transit Association's estimate that 50,000 jobs were generated per $\$ 1$ billion investment, so the $\$ 3$ billion raised in this measure would create approximately 150,000 jobs and that is without accounting for any leveraging of other funds. She added that San Francisco agency grant recipients were also bound to local hire regulations, and agreed that this would be
an important message for this measure.
To Chair Waddling's comments, Ms. Lombardo said that she could provide some examples. For instance, she noted that while Prop K had a small amount annual amount remaining for street resurfacing ( $\sim \$ 2-5$ million estimated), as did Prop AA ( $\sim \$ 2.5$ million), she said those amounts, in addition to the amount included in the new revenue measure, would still would not be enough to get the city to a Pavement Condition Index of 70 , which was the goal. She said contributing to the street resurfacing funding shortfall primarily was the decrease in funding from the state via the gas tax, which had dropped precipitously in recent years (e.g. $\sim \$ 13$ million to $\$ 3$ million), as well as past local decisions to not prioritize street resurfacing in the General Fund. Ms. Lombardo stated that the Transit Optimization and Expansion and Regional Transit categories would allow the city to advance projects such as Muni Forward, subway expansions, the next generation of BRT projects, etc. She mentioned that the comparable Prop K category was Transit Preferential Streets and Bus Rapid Transit, which was funding the Geary Corridor and Van Ness Avenue BRT projects. She said that funding in this category was nearly entirely programmed to specific projects, and that it would help fund Van Ness BRT through construction and Geary BRT through design. She said the Transportation Authority was looking for additional funding sources for Geary BRT, and that for any new projects, including Caltrain or BART, there would need to be a new revenue source. She noted that other counties were in the process of doubling their existing half-cent sales tax to a full cent because the federal and state governments weren't providing sufficient funding noting that Contra Costa and Santa Clara Counties were looking to do this in November 2016 and Alameda County had done this in 2014. She said regarding transit service, Prop K only included operations funding for paratransit, and that in the future, that category would be able to be supplemented through the new measure if costs increased, in addition to many other projects such as late night service, subsidized passes, and investments from the Muni Equity Strategy, which were eligible for Prop K funding. She added that the Smart System Management eligible projects, such providing carpool lanes on the freeway in San Francisco to provide travelers a continuous carpool lane to/from Santa Clara, were not currently eligible for Prop K funds, and that this category would also supplement Transportation Demand Management (TDM), which only received a few hundred thousand dollars per year through Prop K. She ended by saying TDM was a very cost effective way to make the current system work better and to squeeze more capacity out of it while we deliver the larger capacity improvement like new BART cars or transit extensions.

Bradley Wiedmaier noted that the state was looking at a mileage-based fee system to make up for the decrease in gas tax revenue. He acknowledged that the roads were in truly poor condition in San Francisco, and asked what the score for streets was today and how long the state had been underfunding resurfacing. Ms. Lombardo replied that this problem was not unique to San Francisco and that each year the Metropolitan Transportation Commission reported on the state of the system. She said the scale used was from 1-100, with 100 being the top score. She explained that a score of 70 means streets were generally in good shape, and that while she couldn't remember the exact number, San Francisco streets were currently around 62-64. She noted that the value of the state gas tax had been declining for decades, but most precipitously in the last few years with declining gas prices and more fuel efficient vehicles, and that cities were also deciding to spend General Fund dollars on other things besides street resurfacing. She added that the road user charge proposed at the state was cutting edge and would likely be 5-10 years out in the future before it was implemented.

Mr. Wiedmaier expressed concern with the regressive nature of sales taxes. He said he was appreciative of the attempts to make equitable investments in the expenditure plan to mitigate this problem, but that he was concerned to see entire communities disappearing from the City, particularly African American communities. He noted he had lived in other states like Oregon
with no sales tax. Mr. Wiedmaier said he was pleased to see a payroll tax proposed by Supervisor Mar, which was more progressive, and thought that for the 25 -year plan, the city should be able to come up with a more progressive funding source as well. He mentioned that the new head of the Chamber of Commerce had spoken against these new taxes, as there were quite a few on the ballot, but that he was glad to see state Prop 55 which would extend the portion of State Prop 30 which levied a higher income tax on the wealthiest Californians. He said he was pleased to see the equity options, but was also concerned about the politics at the BOS and the CAC's perceived lack of influence given all the potential ballot measures - transportation and otherwise - under consideration. He said these were important and needed services, but that there should be a transition or trigger option to move away from a sales tax for a period of time this long, and expressed disbelief that voters would support this measure.
In response to Chair Waddling's question, Ms. Lombardo stated that the Controller's office estimated that roughly half of the current sales tax revenues come from residents while the rest come from visitors, employees and businesses in the city. She said a vehicle license fee would be paid entirely by San Francisco residents, and added that the BOS did listen to the CAC's perspective. She also pointed out that almost everything in this measure was designed to improve transit or to achieve Vision Zero goals, noting that the equity analysis from the San Francisco Transportation Plan found that transit, bike and pedestrian investments had been shown to disproportionately benefit low-income communities and communities of concern.

Chair Waddling asked how much a low-income resident would be impacted by a sales tax as compared to someone at middle- or high-income levels. Ms. Lombardo replied that one can find several websites that make these calculations. She noted that many categories of basic necessities did not have sales tax paid on them, but that it was true that low-income residents paid a higher percentage of their income in sales taxes than do high-income residents, which made it a regressive tax.

Mr. Sachs said that different states had different tax systems were missing key legs of the financial stool and had to make up for different deficiencies, such as Washington's lack of income taxes. He stated that California's deficiency in government funding was in property taxes, due to Proposition 13. He said he believed that the system was grossly unfair, but that he did not see another way to bolster funding when property tax increases were going to be on a relatively small percentage of property owners. He added that it put constraint on how government could raise revenues. Mr. Sachs said that Muni received about $\$ 200$ million in fare revenues and that their operating budget was about $\$ 600$ million, so reducing fares would impact their budget significantly. He said that lowering fares would just negate the benefits of the sales tax, and that if the sales tax made up for the sales tax impacts on low-income residents, then it would be a good expenditure.
Mr. Larson asked that in the event the charter amendment passed and the sales tax did not, and if the charter amendment were then vetoed, would the measure be put on the next ballot. Ms. Lombardo replied that the plan would be to come back to the ballot if whichever measure was placed on the ballot should fail in the coming election. She said the sales tax could go back to the ballot in 2017 if there were an election (none is currently planned), and that either option could go back in 2018. She confirmed that the general sales tax only needed to receive a majority vote to pass.

Ms. Sachs asked when voters would have to consider reauthorizing Prop K. Ms. Lombardo responded that it would not need to go back to voters until 2033/34 when the measure was over. She said that some line items in Prop K would run out of funding by then because they had advanced funding, but that other categories, including many annual programs, would have funding every year until that point. She added that with Prop B, the Transportation Authority
chose to go to the ballot for reauthorization early because many things came to pass that had not been considered in 1989, and that the Transportation Authority could go to the ballot as early as 2023 to amend the plan, but that the decision had not been made yet.

Ms. Ablog stated that much of the public thought that "transportation" only referred to Muni, which should be considered in messaging. She also said that informed voters would say that the city needed more funding for transportation, particularly with such an extreme increase in new residents and visitors coming to the city in such a short period of time.

Chair Waddling cited Honolulu as a case study of where disinvestment in transportation had really harmed the city which is now facing the prospect of a partially completed train to nowhere. He said he believed that people who were accustomed to commuting by car were skeptical of these types of taxes, so messaging was important, as was trust in the people and agencies that implement the programs. Chair Waddling said that he believed that the SFMTA in particular would need to overcome that barrier.
Mr. Sachs stated that voters tend to respond well to specifics, particularly saying where sales taxes would be invested in. He said that citing specific projects would be helpful, such as the Mline improvements or the carpool lane to Santa Clara, which were tangible projects that the public could rally behind. He said he would like to see funds put into planning so that these projects could get built when federal funds become available, particular as the city undergoes major shifts in commuting patterns. Ms. Lombardo commented that one of the intents of this measure was to advance planning for projects to put the city in a good position for regional or state or federal funds when they became available.

Ms. Sachs stated that Geary LRT was a priority three project in Prop K, and that participants at the BRT workshops continued to ask for light rail, which they had wanted since 1989. She cited numerous documents published in the 1980s and 1990s referencing the light rail project. She added that the Public Utilities Commission had stated that the only way to alleviate the congestion on Geary Boulevard was a light-rail system, because the light-rail operated effectively there from 1912 to the 1950s. She added that in the 1970s, BART wanted to build light-rail under Geary Boulevard and over the Golden Gate Bridge, but that Marin County did not want that. She said Geary LRT was the only Prop B project grandfathered into Prop K that was not receiving funding.
Chair Waddling asked if there were comparisons between BRT and LRT regarding capacity. Ms. Lombardo said she would be happy to forward the data to the CAC. She said that Geary Corridor BRT capacity would be close to the capacity of surface LRT if it could receive red painted lanes, signal prioritization, and all the kinds of improvements needed to give the bus a dedicated right of way. She said this project was chosen because it was a cheaper option that would enable significant improvements on Geary since the city chose to go with the Third Street corridor as the next LRT investment. She noted that at current revenue levels, there was typically only one major transit expansion project at a time. She added that there was currently long-term planning for high-capacity transit through the Subway Vision, and that the Geary Corridor had been identified as a prime candidate for high capacity transit. She noted that a subway was really what would make a significant difference in capacity because then it did not have to operate in traffic.

Chair Waddling asked for clarification on the CAC's action tonight. Ms. Lombardo stated that the transportation sales tax expenditure plan could still be amended, and that endorsement from the CAC could help move the process forward but was not required. She added that the charter amendment could not accept any additional amendments.
Mr. Larson noted that the funding for BART cars no longer included a contingency clause that
the funding would only be expended should the other counties contribute an equal amount to the BART cars procurement. Ms. Lombardo affirmed this, and stated that Transportation Authority Board Chair Weiner felt that this was too important to make contingent on other counties' actions, and noted that under the public utilities code, if the Transportation Authority provided BART funding, BART would have to contribute at least as much as it receives in sales tax funds, which essentially covers the contingency language from the prior version. Ms. Lombardo added that given the tight BOS schedule, she understood that the last time to make amendments would likely be at the BOS Budget and Finance committee the following Wednesday and that those changes indicated in Attachment 3 in the packet were meant to bring the transportation sales tax expenditure plan in line with the charter amendment.

Mr. Sachs moved to amend the Expenditure Plan, Attachment 3, Section 3. A. 2., page 10, lines $21-25$, to " $\ldots$ the SFMTA may transfer up to $50 \%$ of the annual percentage allocation of funds that would otherwise go to this program...", to cap the amount of funding that would be able to be transferred between categories, seconded by John Larson.

Chair Waddling asked how Mr. Sachs intended the change from "shall" to "may" to change the ordinance. Mr. Sachs stated that "shall" was a very strong word, and this would give latitude to the Transportation Authority in working with the SFMTA to decide whether to shift funds. There was no public comment.
The motion was approved by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Larson, J. Sachs, P. Sachs, Waddling and Wiedmaier
Abstentions: CAC Member Ablog
Absent: CAC Members Hogue and Tannen
John Larson moved to endorse the proposed San Francisco Transportation Expenditure Plan as amended, seconded by Chris Waddling.
The item did not pass by the following vote:
Ayes: CAC Members Larson, P. Sachs and Waddling
Abstentions: CAC Members Ablog, J. Sachs and Wiedmaier
Absent: CAC Members Hogue and Tannen

## 3. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

## 4. Adjournment

Chair Waddling thanked the committee for their time on the item over several meetings. Ms. Lombardo also thanked the group for their valuable input. The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.
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## Memorandum

$$
\text { Date: } \quad 09.01 .16
$$

## To: Citizens Advisory Committee

From: Cynthia Fong - Deputy Director for Finance and Administration
Subject: INFORMATION - Investment Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2016

## Summary

The Transportation Authority's Investment Policy directs that a review of portfolio compliance be presented quarterly. As year-end closing is just wrapping up, the investment report for the quarter ended June 30, 2016 is presented independently. Following the annual audit, the Basic Financial Statements will be presented to the Citizens Advisory Committee along with the results of the fiscal audit, single audit, and management review.

## BACKGROUND

The Transportation Authority's Investment Policy (Resolution 16-56) directs a submittal of portfolio compliance with the Investment Policy at the end of the quarter. Usually, this is presented in conjunction with, and in the context of, a quarterly Internal Accounting Report. However, since fiscal year-end project accruals are still being submitted, the Internal Accounting Report is not available at this time.

## DISCUSSION

The investment policies and practices of the Transportation Authority are subject to and limited by applicable provisions of state law, and to prudent money management principles. All investable funds are invested in accordance with the Transportation Authority's Investment Policy and applicable provisions of Chapter 4 of Part I of Division 2 of Title 5 of the California Government Code (Section 53600 et seq). Any investment of bond proceeds will be further restricted by the provisions of relevant bond documents.

In managing its investment program, the Transportation Authority observes the "Prudent Investor" standard as stated in Government Code Section 53600.3, applied in the context of managing an overall portfolio. Investments are to be made with care, skill, prudence and diligence, taking into account the prevailing circumstances, including, but not limited to general economic conditions, the anticipated needs of the Transportation Authority and other relevant factors that a prudent person acting in a fiduciary capacity and familiar with those matters would use in the stewardship of funds of a like character and purpose.

The primary objectives, in priority order, for the Transportation Authority's investment activities are:

1) Safety. Safety of the principal is the foremost objective of the investment program. Investments of the Transportation Authority will be undertaken in a manner that seeks to ensure preservation of the principal of the funds under its control.
2) Liquidity. The Transportation Authority's investment portfolio will remain sufficiently liquid to enable the Transportation Authority to meet its reasonably anticipated cash flow requirements.
3) Return on Investment. The Transportation Authority's investment portfolio will be managed with the objective of attaining a market rate of return throughout budgetary and economic cycles commensurate with the Transportation Authority's investment risk parameters and the cash flow characteristics of the portfolio.
Permitted investment instruments are specifically listed in the Transportation Authority's Investment Policy, and include the San Francisco City and County Treasury Pool. As of June 30, 2016, the Transportation Authority's bank accounts total to $\$ 36.5$ million and approximately $61 \%$ of this amount was invested in the City and County of San Francisco Treasury Pool. The remaining funds are held in bank accounts for daily operations. These investments are in compliance with the Transportation Authority's Board-adopted Investment Policy and provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months. Attachment 1 is the investment report furnished by the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector for the period ending on June 30, 2016.

## ALTERNATIVES

None. This is an information item.

## FINANCIAL IMPACTS

None. This is an information item.

## RECOMMENDATION

None. This is an information item.

Attachment:

1. City and County of San Francisco Investment Report for the Month of June 2016

José Cisneros, Treasurer

Investment Report for the month of June 2016
July 15, 2016

The Honorable Edwin M. Lee
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Franicsco City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Ladies and Gentlemen,
In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of June 30, 2016. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of June 2016 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics *

| (in \$ million) | Current Month |  |  | Prior Month |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fiscal YTD | June 2016 |  | Fiscal YTD |  | May 2016 |  |
| Average Daily Balance | \$ 7,114 | \$ | 7,974 | \$ | 7,037 | \$ | 8,059 |
| Net Earnings | 47.83 |  | 4.91 |  | 42.92 |  | 4.92 |
| Earned Income Yield | 0.67\% |  | 0.75\% |  | 0.66\% |  | 0.72\% |

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics *

| (in \$ million) Investment Type | \% of Portfolio |  | Book Value |  | Market Value | Wtd. Avg. Coupon | Wtd. Avg. YTM | WAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Treasuries | 6.45\% | \$ | 498.2 | \$ | 501.1 | 0.86\% | 0.99\% | 306 |
| Federal Agencies | 51.57\% |  | 4,009.4 |  | 4,007.8 | 0.78\% | 0.72\% | 563 |
| State \& Local Government |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency Obligations | 2.49\% |  | 193.3 |  | 193.6 | 1.26\% | 1.02\% | 426 |
| Public Time Deposits | 0.02\% |  | 1.4 |  | 1.4 | 0.86\% | 0.86\% | 252 |
| Negotiable CDs | 15.97\% |  | 1,240.1 |  | 1,241.1 | 0.90\% | 0.90\% | 193 |
| Commercial Paper | 5.78\% |  | 448.0 |  | 449.1 | 0.00\% | 0.84\% | 91 |
| Medium Term Notes | 8.64\% |  | 674.0 |  | 671.2 | 1.44\% | 0.52\% | 143 |
| Money Market Funds | 7.15\% |  | 555.5 |  | 555.5 | 0.28\% | 0.28\% | 1 |
| Supranationals | 1.93\% |  | 149.8 |  | 150.1 | 0.05\% | 0.47\% | 145 |
| Totals | 100.0\% | \$ | 7,769.7 | \$ | 7,770.8 | 0.78\% | 0.73\% | 372 |

In the remainder of this report, we provide additional information and analytics at the security-level and portfolio-level, as recommended by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission.

Very truly yours,


## José Cisneros

Treasurer

[^0]* Please see last page of this report for non-pooled funds holdings and statistics.
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## Investment Inventory <br> Pooled Fund






 | $\$$ | $30,800,000$ | $\$$ | $30,779,296$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2,670,000$ |  | $2,670,000$ |  |
| $44,000,000$ |  | $44,046,200$ |  |
|  | $5,505,000$ |  | $5,505,000$ |
|  | $3,250,000$ |  | $3,250,000$ |
| $16,500,000$ |  | $16,558,905$ |  |
|  | $5,000,000$ | $5,004,550$ |  |
|  | $50,000,000$ |  | $50,121,500$ |
|  | $2,470,000$ |  | $2,470,000$ |
|  | $2,000,000$ |  | $2,000,000$ |
|  | $4,180,000$ |  | $4,214,443$ |
|  | $16,325,000$ |  | $16,461,640$ |
|  | $8,500,000$ |  | $10,217,510$ |
| $\$ 191,200,000$ | $\$$ | $193,299,044$ |  | ○ o on ${ }^{\circ}$



 $\leftrightarrow$
 $\leftrightarrow$

 $\infty$ | $N$ | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $N$ | $\infty$ | 0 | 0 | $\infty$ | $N$ | $\infty$ |
| 0 | 0 | $\leftarrow$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |





## 7／ <br> 

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MONTEREY PENINSULA CA CMNTY | State／Local Agencies | 91411SGE4 |
| :--- | :--- |
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| State／Local Agencies | 91412GSB2 |
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| State／Local Agencies | 6055804 W 6 |
| Subtotals |  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE } & 4 / 10 / 2014 \\ \text { CALIFORNIA ST } & 11 / 5 / 2013\end{array}$ CALIFORNIA ST
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은ㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㄴㄴN

 Par Ve
 © ？
 Dura
$\begin{array}{rr}\text { Settle } & \text { Maturity } \\ \text { Date } & \text { Date }\end{array}$
～융 D
$1 / 20$
$/ 20$
$/ 20$
$3 / 201$
$/ 201$
$/ 201$
$/ 201$
$/ 201$
$/ 2017$
201
201
201

 Issuer Name
TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY
BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA HOUS
BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY
BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY

 | Type of Investment | CUSIP |
| :--- | :--- |
| Negotiable CDs | 89113E2G0 |
| Negotiable CDs | 96121TK64 |
| Negotiable CDs | 89113WAL0 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06417HE36 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06417HE36 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06427EX55 |
| Negotiable CDs | 78009NZW9 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06427EDJ7 |
| Negotiable CDs | 89113EC79 |
| Negotiable CDs | 89113E5Z5 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06417HUR5 |
| Negotiable CDs | 06427EK91 |
| Subtotals |  |
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Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes
Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes

 Medium Term Notes



 Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes
Medium Term Notes

|  |  |  | Settle | Maturity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Amortized |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issuer Name | Date | Date | Duration | Coupon |  | Par Value |  | Book Value |  | Book Value |  | Market Value |
| Medium Term Notes | 36967FAB7 | GENERAL ELECTRIC CO | 1/9/2015 | 1/9/2017 | 0.52 | 0.91 |  | 20,000,000 |  | 20,000,000 |  | 20,000,000 |  | 20,022,600 |
| Medium Term Notes | 064159AM8 | BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA | 10/20/2015 | 1/12/2017 | 0.53 | 2.55 |  | 10,000,000 |  | 10,185,500 |  | 10,080,383 |  | 10,081,300 |
| Medium Term Notes | 90331HMC4 | US BANK NA CINCINNATI | 2/11/2016 | 1/30/2017 | 0.58 | 1.10 |  | 1,500,000 |  | 1,502,567 |  | 1,501,241 |  | 1,500,735 |
| Medium Term Notes | 90331HMC4 | US BANK NA CINCINNATI | 2/12/2016 | 1/30/2017 | 0.58 | 1.10 |  | 8,515,000 |  | 8,526,297 |  | 8,519,932 |  | 8,519,172 |
| Medium Term Notes | 90331HMC4 | US BANK NA CINCINNATI | 6/24/2016 | 1/30/2017 | 0.58 | 1.10 |  | 10,000,000 |  | 10,056,200 |  | 10,011,812 |  | 10,004,900 |
| Medium Term Notes | 36962G2F0 | GENERAL ELECTRIC CO | 4/8/2015 | 2/15/2017 | 0.62 | 0.80 |  | 3,791,000 |  | 3,789,138 |  | 3,790,372 |  | 3,793,123 |
| Medium Term Notes | 36962G2F0 | GENERAL ELECTRIC CO | 4/1/2015 | 2/15/2017 | 0.62 | 0.80 |  | 4,948,000 |  | 4,942,755 |  | 4,946,249 |  | 4,950,771 |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236TCC7 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP | 4/14/2015 | 2/16/2017 | 0.63 | 0.82 |  | 10,000,000 |  | 10,006,300 |  | 10,002,150 |  | 10,000,900 |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236TCC7 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP | 2/20/2015 | 2/16/2017 | 0.63 | 0.82 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,000,000 |  | 50,004,500 |
| Medium Term Notes | 91159HHD5 | US BANCORP | 2/3/2016 | 5/15/2017 | 0.87 | 1.65 |  | 3,090,000 |  | 3,111,908 |  | 3,104,918 |  | 3,104,801 |
| Medium Term Notes | 459200JD4 | IBM CORP | 2/19/2016 | 8/18/2017 | 1.13 | 1.08 |  | 25,000,000 |  | 25,000,000 |  | 25,000,000 |  | 25,085,000 |
| Medium Term Notes | 459200GJ4 | IBM CORP | 3/22/2016 | 9/14/2017 | 1.17 | 5.70 |  | 1,325,000 |  | 1,417,057 |  | 1,398,505 |  | 1,399,717 |
| Medium Term Notes | 911312AP1 | UNITED PARCEL SERVICE | 1/28/2016 | 10/1/2017 | 1.24 | 1.13 |  | 2,000,000 |  | 2,003,780 |  | 2,002,823 |  | 2,008,200 |
| Medium Term Notes | 459200HK0 | IBM CORP | 5/6/2016 | 2/8/2018 | 1.59 | 1.25 |  | 11,450,000 |  | 11,554,602 |  | 11,513,553 |  | 11,520,990 |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236TCY9 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP | 4/8/2016 | 4/6/2018 | 1.75 | 1.01 |  | 45,000,000 |  | 45,000,000 |  | 45,000,000 |  | 45,043,200 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  | 0.37 | 1.44 | + | 670,676,000 | \$ | 673,989,672 | \$ | 671,013,348 | \$ | 671,178,412 |

[^2]
## Monthly Investment Earnings

| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issuer Name |  | Par Value | Coupon | YTM ${ }^{1}$ | $\frac{\text { Settle }}{\text { Date }}$ | $\frac{\text { Maturity }}{\text { Date }}$ |  | Earned Interest |  | Amort. <br> Expense |  |  |  | Income Earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828WQ9 | US TSY NT | \$ |  | 0.50 | 0.39 | 3/15/16 | 6/30/16 | \$ | 9,959 | \$ | $(2,117)$ | \$ |  | \$ | 7,841 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828RJ1 | US TSY NT |  | 75,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 10/11/11 | 9/30/16 |  | 61,475 |  | 2,807 |  |  |  | 64,282 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828RM4 | US TSY NT |  | 25,000,000 | 1.00 | 0.74 | 12/26/13 | 10/31/16 |  | 20,380 |  | $(5,296)$ |  |  |  | 15,084 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828RX0 | US TSY NT |  | 25,000,000 | 0.88 | 0.67 | 2/25/14 | 12/31/16 |  | 18,022 |  | $(4,197)$ |  |  |  | 13,825 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828SJ0 | US TSY NT |  | 25,000,000 | 0.88 | 1.21 | 3/21/12 | 2/28/17 |  | 17,833 |  | 6,655 |  |  |  | 24,488 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828SJ0 | US TSY NT |  | 25,000,000 | 0.88 | 1.21 | 3/21/12 | 2/28/17 |  | 17,833 |  | 6,655 |  |  |  | 24,488 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828SJ0 | US TSY NT |  | 75,000,000 | 0.88 | 0.94 | 3/14/12 | 2/28/17 |  | 53,499 |  | 3,783 |  |  |  | 57,282 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828SM3 | US TSY NT |  | 50,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.07 | 4/4/12 | 3/31/17 |  | 40,984 |  | 2,701 |  |  |  | 43,685 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828TM2 | US TSY NT |  | 100,000,000 | 0.63 | 0.96 | 12/15/15 | 8/31/17 |  | 50,951 |  | 27,188 |  |  |  | 78,139 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828M72 | US TSY NT |  | 50,000,000 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 12/17/15 | 11/30/17 |  | 35,861 |  | 4,924 |  |  |  | 40,785 |
| U.S. Treasuries | 912828M72 | US TSY NT |  | 50,000,000 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 12/17/15 | 11/30/17 |  | 35,861 |  | 5,088 |  |  |  | 40,949 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$ | 500,000,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 362,657 | \$ | 48,190 | \$ | - | \$ | 410,847 |
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$\leftrightarrow$
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FARMER MAC
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BK IL
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BK IL
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BK IL
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BK IL
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BK IL
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FREDDIE MAC
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT
FANNIE DISCOUNT NOTE
FANNIE MAE
FARMER MAC
FARMER MAC
FAR

Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies
Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies
 Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies Federal Agencies
 Federal Agencies

 | $\infty$ |
| :--- |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| $\cdots$ |
| $\frac{1}{0}$ |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |

 $\infty$
$\frac{1}{0}$
$\frac{\square}{0}$
$\frac{0}{1}$
$\frac{\pi}{0}$
$\frac{0}{0}$ Federal Agencies
 Federal Agencies

Issuer Name
FARMER MAC
FARMER MAC
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## Monthly Investment Earnings








Issuer Name
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FREDDIE MAC
FREDDIE MAC
FREDDIE MAC
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FANNIE MAE
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FREDDIE MAC
FANNIE MAE
FREDDIE MAC
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FREDDIE MAC
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FREDDIE MAC
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FANNIE MAE
FREDDIE MAC
FREDDIE MAC
FREDDIE MAC
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FREDDIE MAC
FREDDIE MAC
FREDDIE MAC
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK
FANNIE MAE
FANNIE MAE

| Type of Investment | CUSIP |
| :--- | :--- |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EAUW6 |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E G H 7$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3137 E A D H 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3137 E A D H 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 5 W 50$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A 8 L 35$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E C V 92$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E C V G 6$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3135 G 0 F 24$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E F X 3$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3137 E A D L 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3135 G 0 F 57$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 7 M 81$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E T S 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A 6 L Z 8$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E B R 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E J 76$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 44 F 2$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A 3 H F 4$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3137 E A D X 4$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E F E 5$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E M H 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E M H 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E A N 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E A N 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E A N 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E F N K 9$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E N 71$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E Q 86$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E Q 86$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E F W G 8$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E Z C 7$ |
| Federal Agencies | $31331 K J B 7$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3130 A 6 Z 42$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E U 40$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3135 G 0 W J 8$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 9 E T 0$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 9 G G 6$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 9 H C 4$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E F C T 2$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E F C T 2$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3136 G 2 N Z 6$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E E W 48$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E F S H 1$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3133 E G G C 3$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 9 R Z 2$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 9 U Y 1$ |
| Federal Agencies | $3134 G 9 U Y 1$ |
| $3136 G 2 N Z 6$ |  |


| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issuer Name | Par Value | Coupon | YTM ${ }^{1}$ | Settle <br> Date | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Maturity } \\ \text { Date } \end{array}$ | Earned Interest |  | Amort. Expense | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Realized } \\ \text { Gain/(Loss) } \end{array}$ |  | arned Income <br> Net Earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EGFK6 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 25,000,000 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 6/17/16 | 10/17/18 | 5,600 |  | - |  |  | 5,600 |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EGFK6 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 25,000,000 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 6/17/16 | 10/17/18 | 5,600 |  | - | - |  | 5,600 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G73D1 | FREDDIE MAC | 50,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 10/29/15 | 10/29/18 | 31,250 |  | - | - |  | 31,250 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G82B4 | FREDDIE MAC | 25,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 11/23/15 | 11/23/18 | 15,625 |  | - | - |  | 15,625 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G85Z8 | FREDDIE MAC | - | 0.88 | 0.88 | 12/4/15 | 12/4/18 | 5,469 |  | - | - |  | 5,469 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8AT6 | FREDDIE MAC | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | 12/11/15 | 12/11/18 | 6,944 |  | - | - |  | 6,944 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8CS6 | FREDDIE MAC | - | 0.63 | 0.63 | 12/28/15 | 12/28/18 | 11,719 |  | - | - |  | 11,719 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G2C39 | FANNIE MAE | 15,000,000 | 1.63 | 1.63 | 12/30/14 | 12/28/18 | 20,313 |  | - | - |  | 20,313 |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EGDM4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 25,000,000 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 6/2/16 | 1/2/19 | 12,664 |  | - | - |  | 12,664 |
| Federal Agencies | 3132X0EK3 | FARMER MAC | 25,000,000 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 1/25/16 | 1/25/19 | 15,377 |  | - | - |  | 15,377 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8GD5 | FREDDIE MAC | 25,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1/29/16 | 1/29/19 | 20,833 |  | - | - |  | 20,833 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8H69 | FREDDIE MAC | 19,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1/29/16 | 1/29/19 | 15,833 |  | 104 | - |  | 15,937 |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EGBU8 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 50,000,000 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 5/25/16 | 2/25/19 | 25,936 |  | - | - |  | 25,936 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8K81 | FREDDIE MAC | 5,500,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2/26/16 | 2/26/19 | 4,583 |  | - | - |  | 4,583 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8K81 | FREDDIE MAC | 12,500,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2/26/16 | 2/26/19 | 10,417 |  | - | - |  | 10,417 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8LN7 | FREDDIE MAC | 25,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 2/26/16 | 2/26/19 | 15,625 |  | - | - |  | 15,625 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G2XK8 | FANNIE MAE | 25,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 2/26/16 | 2/26/19 | 15,625 |  | - | - |  | 15,625 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G2Y68 | FANNIE MAE | 15,935,000 | 0.75 | 0.77 | 2/26/16 | 2/26/19 | 9,959 |  | 218 | - |  | 10,177 |
| Federal Agencies | $3132 X 0 E D 9$ | FARMER MAC | 40,000,000 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 1/19/16 | 3/19/19 | 23,423 |  | - | - |  | 23,423 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3FC4 | FANNIE MAE | 6,250,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 3/29/16 | 3/29/19 | 5,208 |  | - | - |  | 5,208 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8VT3 | FREDDIE MAC | 14,560,000 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 5/23/16 | 4/25/19 | 9,707 |  | 20 | - |  | 9,727 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G9DB0 | FREDDIE MAC | 10,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 4/29/16 | 4/29/19 | 6,250 |  | - | - |  | 6,250 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G9DB0 | FREDDIE MAC | 50,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 4/29/16 | 4/29/19 | 31,250 |  | - | - |  | 31,250 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3QP3 | FANNIE MAE | 10,000,000 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 5/24/16 | 5/24/19 | 10,417 |  | - | - |  | 10,417 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G9LF2 | FREDDIE MAC | 75,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 6/7/16 | 6/7/19 | 37,500 |  | - | - |  | 37,500 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3NK7 | FANNIE MAE | 25,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 6/7/16 | 6/7/19 | 12,500 |  | 82 | - |  | 12,582 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3NM3 | FANNIE MAE | 50,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 6/7/16 | 6/7/19 | 25,000 |  | - | - |  | 25,000 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G9QN0 | FREDDIE MAC | 12,500,000 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 6/14/16 | 6/14/19 | 5,165 |  | - | - |  | 5,165 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G9QP5 | FREDDIE MAC | 11,500,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 6/14/16 | 6/14/19 | 5,431 |  | - | - |  | 5,431 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G9QW0 | FREDDIE MAC | 50,000,000 | 1.28 | 1.28 | 6/14/16 | 6/14/19 | 30,222 |  | - | - |  | 30,222 |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EGED3 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 25,000,000 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 6/9/16 | 8/9/19 | 9,637 |  | - | - |  | 9,637 |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EGED3 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 25,000,000 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 6/9/16 | 8/9/19 | 9,637 |  | - | - |  | 9,637 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G9GS0 | FREDDIE MAC | 25,000,000 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 5/26/16 | 8/26/19 | 26,042 |  | - | - |  | 26,042 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G8TG4 | FREDDIE MAC | 15,000,000 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 4/11/16 | 10/11/19 | 18,750 |  | - | - |  | 18,750 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3LV5 | FANNIE MAE | 8,950,000 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 5/26/16 | 11/26/19 | 10,069 |  | - | - |  | 10,069 |
| Federal Agencies | $3132 \mathrm{XOAT8}$ | FARMER MAC | 41,000,000 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 6/5/15 | 6/2/20 | 20,768 |  | - | - |  | 20,768 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G3TG0 | FANNIE MAE | 15,000,000 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 6/30/16 | 6/30/20 | 479 |  | - | - |  | 479 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G7U33 | FREDDIE MAC | 8,000,000 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 10/29/15 | 10/29/20 | 10,000 |  | - | - |  | 10,000 |
| Federal Agencies | 3134G7U90 | FREDDIE MAC | 10,000,000 | 1.55 | 1.55 | 10/29/15 | 10/29/20 | 12,917 |  | - | - |  | 12,917 |
| Federal Agencies | 3136G2QT7 | FANNIE MAE | 25,000,000 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 10/29/15 | 10/29/20 | 31,250 |  | - | - |  | 31,250 |
| Federal Agencies | 3133EFTX5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 100,000,000 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 12/24/15 | 12/24/20 | 64,609 |  | - | - |  | 64,609 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$4,003,428,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ 2,954,980 | \$ | $(173,134)$ | \$ $(293,822)$ | \$ | 2,488,024 |

## Monthly Investment Earnings

| $5 / 20 / 16$ | $7 / 14 / 16$ | $\$$ | 11,293 | $\$$ | - | $\$$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $5 / 7 / 13$ | $8 / 1 / 16$ | 2,185 | - | - | 11,293 |  |
| $12 / 9 / 14$ | $11 / 1 / 16$ | 27,500 | $(2,000)$ | - | 2,185 |  |
| $6 / 30 / 16$ | $5 / 15 / 17$ | 99 | - | - | 25,500 |  |
| $4 / 10 / 14$ | $5 / 15 / 17$ | 3,310 | - | - | 99 |  |
| $11 / 5 / 13$ | $11 / 1 / 17$ | 24,063 | $(1,213)$ | - | 3,310 |  |
| $12 / 22 / 14$ | $11 / 1 / 17$ | 5,208 | $(131)$ | - | 22,850 |  |
| $11 / 25 / 14$ | $11 / 1 / 17$ | 52,083 | $(3,400)$ | - | 5,078 |  |
| $6 / 30 / 16$ | $5 / 5 / 18$ | 68 | - | - | 48,683 |  |
| $6 / 30 / 16$ | $5 / 15 / 19$ | $7 / 1 / 19$ | 6,256 | $(757)$ | - | 68 |
| $10 / 5 / 15$ | $7 / 1 / 19$ | 24,433 | $(2,997)$ | - | 6,499 |  |
| $10 / 2 / 15$ | $10 / 1 / 19$ | 43,130 | $(31,767)$ | - | 21,437 |  |
| $4 / 23 / 15$ |  | $\$ 99,697$ | $\$$ | $(42,264)$ | $\$$ | - |



| State/Local Agencies | 91411SGE4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| State/Local Agencies | 612574DR1 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CPM6 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GL45 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GUU7 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CFC9 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CPN4 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CPN4 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GL52 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GL60 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GSB2 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GSB2 |
| State/Local Agencies | 6055804W6 |
| Subtotals |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| State/Local Agencies | 91411SGE4 | UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA | $\$$ | $30,800,000$ | 0.00 |
| State/Local Agencies | 612574DR1 | MONTEREY PENINSULA CA CMNT | $2,670,000$ | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CPM6 | CALIFORNIA ST | $44,000,000$ | 0.75 | 0.69 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GL45 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE | $5,505,000$ | 0.65 | 0.65 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GUU7 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE | $3,250,000$ | 1.22 | 1.22 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CFC9 | CALIFORNIA ST | $16,500,000$ | 1.75 | 1.66 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CPN4 | CALIFORNIA ST | $5,000,000$ | 1.25 | 1.22 |
| State/Local Agencies | 13063CPN4 | CALIFORNIA ST | $50,000,000$ | 1.25 | 1.17 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GL52 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE | $2,470,000$ | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GL60 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE | $2,000,000$ | 1.23 | 1.23 |
| State/Local Agencies | 91412GSB2 | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE | $4,180,000$ | 1.80 | 1.57 |
| State/Local Agencies | $91412 G S B 2$ | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA REVENUE | $16,325,000$ | 1.80 | 1.56 |
| State/Local Agencies | $6055804 W 6$ | MISSISSIPPI ST | $8,500,000$ | 6.09 | 1.38 |
| Subtotals |  | $\$$ | $191,200,000$ |  |  |
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Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes
 Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes Medium Term Notes







 Medium Term Notes

| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issuer Name |  | Par Value | Coupon | YTM ${ }^{1}$ | Settle <br> Date | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Maturity } \\ \text { Date } \end{array}$ |  | Earned <br> Interest |  | Amort. Expense |  |  | arned Income Net Earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Medium Term Notes | 073928S46 | BEAR STEARNS COS LLC |  | 6,450,000 | 1.04 | 1.36 | 2/10/16 | 11/21/16 |  | 5,611 |  | 1,080 |  |  | 6,690 |
| Medium Term Notes | 36967FAB7 | GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  | 20,000,000 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1/9/15 | 1/9/17 |  | 15,147 |  |  |  |  | 15,147 |
| Medium Term Notes | 064159AM8 | BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA |  | 10,000,000 | 2.55 | 1.03 | 10/20/15 | 1/12/17 |  | 21,250 |  | $(12,367)$ |  |  | 8,883 |
| Medium Term Notes | 90331HMC4 | US BANK NA CINCINNATI |  | 1,500,000 | 1.10 | 0.96 | 2/11/16 | 1/30/17 |  | 1,375 |  | (175) |  |  | 1,200 |
| Medium Term Notes | 90331HMC4 | US BANK NA CINCINNATI |  | 8,515,000 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 2/12/16 | 1/30/17 |  | 7,805 |  | (695) |  |  | 7,111 |
| Medium Term Notes | 90331HMC4 | US BANK NA CINCINNATI |  | 10,000,000 | 1.10 | 0.90 | 6/24/16 | 1/30/17 |  | 2,139 |  | (388) |  |  | 1,751 |
| Medium Term Notes | 36962G2F0 | GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  | 3,791,000 | 0.80 | 0.86 | 4/8/15 | 2/15/17 |  | 2,515 |  | 82 |  |  | 2,597 |
| Medium Term Notes | 36962G2F0 | GENERAL ELECTRIC CO |  | 4,948,000 | 0.80 | 0.94 | 4/1/15 | 2/15/17 |  | 3,283 |  | 229 |  |  | 3,512 |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236TCC7 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 10,000,000 | 0.82 | 0.73 | 4/14/15 | 2/16/17 |  | 6,801 |  | (280) |  |  | 6,520 |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236TCC7 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 50,000,000 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 2/20/15 | 2/16/17 |  | 34,004 |  | - |  |  | 34,004 |
| Medium Term Notes | 91159HHD5 | US BANCORP |  | 3,090,000 | 1.65 | 1.09 | 2/3/16 | 5/15/17 |  | 4,249 |  | $(1,407)$ |  |  | 2,841 |
| Medium Term Notes | 459200JD4 | IBM CORP |  | 25,000,000 | 1.08 | 1.08 | 2/19/16 | 8/18/17 |  | 22,419 |  | - |  |  | 22,419 |
| Medium Term Notes | 459200GJ4 | IBM CORP |  | 1,325,000 | 5.70 | 1.04 | 3/22/16 | 9/14/17 |  | 6,294 |  | $(5,012)$ |  |  | 1,282 |
| Medium Term Notes | 911312AP1 | UNITED PARCEL SERVICE |  | 2,000,000 | 1.13 | 1.01 | 1/28/16 | 10/1/17 |  | 1,875 |  | (185) |  |  | 1,690 |
| Medium Term Notes | 459200HKO | IBM CORP |  | 11,450,000 | 1.25 | 0.90 | 5/6/16 | 2/8/18 |  | 11,927 |  | $(3,248)$ |  |  | 8,679 |
| Medium Term Notes | 89236TCY9 | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP |  | 45,000,000 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 4/8/16 | 4/6/18 |  | 37,898 |  | - |  |  | 37,898 |
| Subtotals |  |  | \$ | 670,676,000 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 805,429 | \$ | $(337,542)$ | \$ | \$ | 467,887 |


| For month ended June 30, 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transaction | Settle Date | Maturity Type of Investment | Issuer Name | CUSIP |  | Par Value | Coupon | YTM |  | Price |  | Interest |  | Transaction |
| Purchase | 6/1/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | BLACKROCK LIQUIDITY FUND | 09248 U 718 | \$ | 894 | 0.21 | 0.21 | \$ | 100.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 894 |
| Purchase | 6/1/2016 | 9/30/2016 Federal Agencies | FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT | 313384H85 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.49 |  | 99.84 |  |  |  | 24,958,826 |
| Purchase | 6/2/2016 | 3/2/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 3130A8D83 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.49 | 0.49 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/2/2016 | 3/10/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 3133782N0 |  | 22,185,000 | 0.88 | 0.72 |  | 100.12 |  | 44,216 |  | 22,256,119 |
| Purchase | 6/2/2016 | 1/2/2019 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EGDM4 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.61 | 0.61 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/3/2016 | 8/24/2016 Commercial Paper | MICROSOFT CORP | 59515MHQ1 |  | 30,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.50 |  | 99.89 |  |  |  | 29,965,833 |
| Purchase | 6/6/2016 | 3/3/2017 Commercial Paper | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP | 89233GQ33 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.02 |  | 99.24 |  |  |  | 24,810,625 |
| Purchase | 6/7/2016 | 6/14/2016 Commercial Paper | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY | 06538BFE8 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.40 |  | 99.99 |  |  |  | 49,996,111 |
| Purchase | 6/7/2016 | 6/7/2019 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3134G9LF2 |  | 75,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 75,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/7/2016 | 6/7/2019 Federal Agencies | FANNIE MAE | 3136G3NK7 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.76 |  | 99.99 |  |  |  | 24,996,250 |
| Purchase | 6/7/2016 | 6/7/2019 Federal Agencies | FANNIE MAE | 3136G3NM3 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 50,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/8/2016 | 3/6/2017 Negotiable CDs | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 06427EX55 |  | 25,000,000 | 1.03 | 1.03 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/9/2016 | 8/9/2019 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EGED3 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.65 | 0.65 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/9/2016 | 8/9/2019 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EGED3 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.65 | 0.65 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/9/2016 | 3/6/2017 Commercial Paper | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP | 89233GQ66 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.01 |  | 99.25 |  |  |  | 24,812,500 |
| Purchase | 6/10/2016 | 3/7/2017 Commercial Paper | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP | 89233GQ74 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 1.01 |  | 99.25 |  |  |  | 24,812,500 |
| Purchase | 6/13/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | FIDELITY INSTITUTIONAL M | 31607A703 |  | 75,000,000 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 75,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/13/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | MORGAN STANLEY INSTITUTI | 61747C707 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 50,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/14/2016 | 6/14/2019 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3134G9QN0 |  | 12,500,000 | 0.88 | 0.88 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 12,500,000 |
| Purchase | 6/14/2016 | 6/14/2019 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3134G9QP5 |  | 11,500,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 11,500,000 |
| Purchase | 6/14/2016 | 6/14/2019 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3134G9QW0 |  | 50,000,000 | 1.28 | 1.28 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 50,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/16/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | FIDELITY INSTITUTIONAL M | 31607A703 |  | 100,000,000 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 100,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/16/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | MORGAN STANLEY INSTITUTI | 61747C707 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 50,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/17/2016 | 10/17/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EGFK6 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.58 | 0.58 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/17/2016 | 10/17/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EGFK6 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.58 | 0.58 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/20/2016 | 12/15/2016 Commercial Paper | BANK TOKYO-MIT UFJ NY | 06538BMF7 |  | 40,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.94 |  | 99.54 |  |  |  | 39,814,089 |
| Purchase | 6/20/2016 | 6/20/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EGGC3 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.57 | 0.57 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/21/2016 | 12/16/2016 Federal Agencies | FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT | $313384 T 58$ |  | 24,625,000 | 0.00 | 0.48 |  | 99.76 |  |  |  | 24,566,557 |
| Purchase | 6/22/2016 | 6/22/2018 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | $3134 \mathrm{G9RZ2}$ |  | 8,950,000 | 0.80 | 0.80 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 8,950,000 |
| Purchase | 6/24/2016 | 7/20/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 3130 A8L35 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.75 | 0.75 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/24/2016 | 6/27/2016 Supranationals | INTL BK RECON \& DEVELOP | 459052YR1 |  | 30,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 29,999,250 |
| Purchase | 6/24/2016 | 1/30/2017 Medium Term Notes | US BANK NA CINCINNATI | $90331 \mathrm{HMC4}$ |  | 10,000,000 | 1.10 | 0.90 |  | 100.12 |  | 44,000 |  | 10,056,200 |
| Purchase | 6/28/2016 | 9/21/2016 Negotiable CDs | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 06427E3U3 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.64 | 0.64 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/28/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | FIDELITY INSTITUTIONAL M | 31607A703 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 50,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/28/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | MORGAN STANLEY INSTITUTI | 61747 C 707 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 50,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/29/2016 | 6/29/2018 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3134G9UY1 |  | 25,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/29/2016 | 6/29/2018 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3134G9UY1 |  | 25,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/29/2016 | 6/29/2017 Public Time Deposits | UMPQUA BANK | PP7C0E3S1 |  | 240,000 | 0.79 | 0.79 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 240,000 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 9/9/2016 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 3130A6BD8 |  | 15,000,000 | 0.51 | 0.35 |  | 100.03 |  | 23,588 |  | 15,028,088 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 6/30/2020 Federal Agencies | FANNIE MAE | 3136G3TG0 |  | 15,000,000 | 1.15 | 1.15 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 15,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | FIDELITY INSTITUTIONAL M | 31607 A703 |  | 63,527 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 63,527 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | FIDELITY INSTITUTIONAL M | 31607A703 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 50,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | MORGAN STANLEY INSTITUTI | 61747 C 707 |  | 12,858 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 12,858 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | MORGAN STANLEY INSTITUTI | 61747 C 707 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 50,000,000 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 5/15/2017 State/Local Agencies | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA RE | 91412GL45 |  | 5,505,000 | 0.65 | 0.65 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 5,505,000 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 5/5/2018 State/Local Agencies | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA RE | 91412GL52 |  | 2,470,000 | 0.99 | 0.99 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 2,470,000 |
| Purchase | 6/30/2016 | 5/15/2019 State/Local Agencies | UNIV OF CALIFORNIA CA RE | 91412GL60 |  | 2,000,000 | 1.23 | 1.23 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 2,000,000 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  |  | ,355,052,279 | 0.46 | 0.58 | \$ | 99.94 | \$ | 111,803 |  | ,354,315,227 |
| Sale | 6/1/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | MORGAN STANLEY INSTITUTI | 61747 C 707 | \$ | 50,000,000 | 0.25 | 0.25 | \$ | 100.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 50,000,000 |
| Sale | 6/2/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | FIDELITY INSTITUTIONAL M | 31607 A703 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 50,000,000 |
| Sale | 6/7/2016 | 7/1/2016 Money Market Funds | FIDELITY INSTITUTIONAL M | 31607A703 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 50,000,000 |


| Transaction | Settle Date | Maturity | Type of Investment | Issuer Name | CUSIP |  | Par Value | Coupon | YTM |  | Price |  | Interest |  | Transaction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sale | 6/8/2016 | 8/10/2016 | Federal Agencies | FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT | 313384B57 |  | 30,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.34 |  | 99.95 |  |  |  | 29,983,725 |
| Sale | 6/8/2016 | 7/5/2016 | Federal Agencies | FANNIE MAE | 3135G0XP3 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.38 | 0.59 |  | 100.01 |  | 79,688 |  | 50,084,735 |
| Sale | 6/9/2016 | 9/14/2016 | Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EDH21 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.45 | 0.49 |  | 100.02 |  | 16,411 |  | 50,026,711 |
| Sale | 6/13/2016 | 9/23/2016 | Medium Term Notes | TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP | 89236TBV6 |  | 47,500,000 | 0.61 | 0.61 |  | 100.00 |  | 66,408 |  | 47,566,408 |
| Sale | 6/15/2016 | 9/9/2016 | Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 313370TW8 |  | 25,000,000 | 2.00 | 0.55 |  | 100.37 |  | 133,333 |  | 25,225,333 |
| Sale | 6/15/2016 | 9/30/2016 | Federal Agencies | FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT | 313384H85 |  | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.49 |  | 99.88 |  |  |  | 24,969,683 |
| Sale | 6/15/2016 | 7/1/2016 | Money Market Funds | FIDELITY INSTITUTIONAL M | 31607A703 |  | 100,000,000 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 100,000,000 |
| Sale | 6/15/2016 | 7/1/2016 | Money Market Funds | MORGAN STANLEY INSTITUTI | 61747C707 |  | 50,000,000 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 100.00 |  | - |  | 50,000,000 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 527,500,000 | 0.39 | 0.39 | \$ | 100.01 | \$ | 295,839 | \$ | 527,856,594 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3134G85Z8 | $\$$ | $75,000,000$ | 0.88 | 0.88 | 100.00 | $\$$ |  | - | $\$ 5,000,000$ |
| 3134G8AT6 | $25,000,000$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 100.00 |  | - | $25,000,000$ |  |  |
| 3134G8CS6 | $25,000,000$ | 0.63 | 0.63 | 100.00 |  | - | $25,000,000$ |  |  |
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 6/24/2016 Federal Agencies



 6/30/2016 Federal Agencies $\circ$ $\stackrel{0}{\circ}$ Maturity

| Transaction | Settle Date | Maturity Type of Investment | Issuer Name | CUSIP | Par Value | Coupon | YTM |  | Price |  | Interest |  | Transaction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maturity | 6/30/2016 | 6/30/2016 Federal Agencies | FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT | 313384YU7 | 25,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.32 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 25,000,000 |
| Maturity | 6/30/2016 | 6/30/2016 Federal Agencies | FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT | 313384YU7 | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.36 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 50,000,000 |
| Maturity | 6/30/2016 | 6/30/2016 Federal Agencies | FED HOME LN DISCOUNT NT | 313384YU7 | 50,000,000 | 0.00 | 0.36 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 50,000,000 |
| Maturity | 6/30/2016 | 6/30/2016 Commercial Paper | IBM CORP | 45920FFW3 | 14,200,000 | 0.00 | 0.44 |  | 100.00 |  |  |  | 14,200,000 |
| Maturity | 6/30/2016 | 6/30/2016 U.S. Treasuries | US TSY NT | 912828WQ9 | 25,000,000 | 0.50 | 0.39 |  | 100.00 |  | 62,500 |  | 25,062,500 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  | \$1,202,901,000 | 0.70 | 0.44 | \$ | - | \$ | 4,091,576 | \$1,206,992,576 |  |
| Interest | 6/1/2016 | 2/1/2017 Negotiable CDs | TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY | 89113E2G0 | \$ 50,000,000 | 0.94 | 0.94 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | \$ | 37,813 |
| Interest | 6/2/2016 | 6/2/2020 Federal Agencies | FARMER MAC | 3132X0AT8 | 41,000,000 | 0.58 | 0.58 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 20,435 |
| Interest | 6/2/2016 | 2/2/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEMH0 | 4,000,000 | 0.49 | 0.50 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 1,684 |
| Interest | 6/2/2016 | 2/2/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEMH0 | 35,000,000 | 0.49 | 0.52 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 14,732 |
| Interest | 6/2/2016 | 12/2/2016 Negotiable CDs | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 78009NXP6 | 50,000,000 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 123,063 |
| Interest | 6/3/2016 | 5/3/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEU40 | 69,000,000 | 0.48 | 0.48 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 28,449 |
| Interest | 6/4/2016 | 12/4/2018 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3134G85Z8 | 75,000,000 | 0.88 | 0.88 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 164,063 |
| Interest | 6/5/2016 | 6/5/2017 Federal Agencies | FARMER MAC | 31315PZQ5 | 9,000,000 | 1.11 | 0.80 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 49,950 |
| Interest | 6/5/2016 | 2/5/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEANO | 25,000,000 | 0.48 | 0.48 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 10,245 |
| Interest | 6/5/2016 | 2/5/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEAN0 | 25,000,000 | 0.48 | 0.49 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 10,245 |
| Interest | 6/5/2016 | 2/5/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEAN0 | 50,000,000 | 0.48 | 0.49 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 20,490 |
| Interest | 6/5/2016 | 10/5/2017 Federal Agencies | FANNIE MAE | 3135G0F57 | 25,000,000 | 0.45 | 0.47 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9,599 |
| Interest | 6/7/2016 | 10/7/2016 Negotiable CDs | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 06366CC48 | 50,000,000 | 0.70 | 0.70 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 28,080 |
| Interest | 6/7/2016 | 12/7/2016 Negotiable CDs | TORONTO DOMINION BANK NY | 89113EU20 | 50,000,000 | 0.97 | 0.97 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 123,382 |
| Interest | 6/7/2016 | 10/7/2016 Medium Term Notes | WESTPAC BANKING CORP | 9612E0DB0 | 50,000,000 | 0.69 | 0.69 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 27,677 |
| Interest | 6/8/2016 | 12/8/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 3130A3HF4 | 25,000,000 | 1.13 | 1.19 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 140,625 |
| Interest | 6/8/2016 | 6/8/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EFCT2 | 25,000,000 | 0.49 | 0.49 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 10,595 |
| Interest | 6/8/2016 | 6/8/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EFCT2 | 50,000,000 | 0.49 | 0.49 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 21,190 |
| Interest | 6/8/2016 | 8/8/2016 Negotiable CDs | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 78009NVT0 | 25,000,000 | 0.67 | 0.67 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 13,899 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 313371 PV2 | 6,545,000 | 1.63 | 0.48 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 53,178 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 313371PV2 | 25,000,000 | 1.63 | 0.64 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 203,125 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 313371PV2 | 25,000,000 | 1.63 | 0.65 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 203,125 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 313371PV2 | 25,000,000 | 1.63 | 0.72 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 203,125 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 6/9/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 313379FW4 | 12,000,000 | 1.00 | 0.93 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 60,000 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 6/9/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 313379FW4 | 20,600,000 | 1.00 | 1.02 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 103,000 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 2/9/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EFNK9 | 25,000,000 | 0.53 | 0.54 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 11,133 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 9/9/2016 Medium Term Notes | TORONTO-DOMINION BANK | 89114QAL2 | 18,930,000 | 1.12 | -0.66 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 53,026 |
| Interest | 6/9/2016 | 9/9/2016 Medium Term Notes | TORONTO-DOMINION BANK | 89114QAL2 | 24,000,000 | 1.12 | -0.57 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 67,227 |
| Interest | 6/10/2016 | 3/10/2017 Negotiable CDs | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 78009NZW9 | 50,000,000 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 40,812 |
| Interest | 6/11/2016 | 10/11/2016 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EDJA1 | 25,000,000 | 0.46 | 0.52 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9,874 |
| Interest | 6/11/2016 | 6/11/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEW48 | 50,000,000 | 0.48 | 0.49 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 20,824 |
| Interest | 6/11/2016 | 12/11/2018 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3134G8AT6 | 25,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 125,000 |
| Interest | 6/13/2016 | 8/12/2016 Negotiable CDs | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 06366CWA2 | 25,000,000 | 0.68 | 0.68 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 15,051 |
| Interest | 6/13/2016 | 11/13/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEBR0 | 25,000,000 | 0.47 | 0.49 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 10,003 |
| Interest | 6/14/2016 | 6/14/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EFSH1 | 25,000,000 | 1.17 | 1.25 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 146,250 |
| Interest | 6/15/2016 | 6/15/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 3130A3SL9 | 25,000,000 | 0.95 | 1.02 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 118,750 |
| Interest | 6/15/2016 | 12/15/2017 Federal Agencies | FREDDIE MAC | 3137EADX4 | 25,000,000 | 1.00 | 1.06 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 127,778 |
| Interest | 6/15/2016 | 12/15/2016 Negotiable CDs | ROYAL BANK OF CANADA NY | 78009NSX5 | 100,000,000 | 0.81 | 0.81 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 207,984 |
| Interest | 6/16/2016 | 4/16/2018 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEZC7 | 50,000,000 | 0.48 | 0.49 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 20,858 |
| Interest | 6/16/2016 | 12/16/2016 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 3133XHZK1 | 33,850,000 | 4.75 | 0.48 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 803,938 |
| Interest | 6/16/2016 | 8/16/2017 Federal Agencies | FANNIE MAE | 3135G0F24 | 25,000,000 | 0.44 | 0.46 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 9,568 |
| Interest | 6/17/2016 | 3/17/2017 Negotiable CDs | BANK OF MONTREAL CHICAGO | 06427EDJ7 | 25,000,000 | 0.83 | 0.83 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 17,953 |
| Interest | 6/18/2016 | 12/18/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EEFE5 | 50,000,000 | 1.13 | 1.18 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 281,250 |
| Interest | 6/19/2016 | 12/19/2016 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK | 3130A12F4 | 20,500,000 | 0.70 | 0.70 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 71,750 |
| Interest | 6/19/2016 | 3/19/2019 Federal Agencies | FARMER MAC | 3132X0ED9 | 40,000,000 | 0.69 | 0.69 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 70,881 |
| Interest | 6/19/2016 | 6/19/2017 Federal Agencies | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK | 3133EAUW6 | 50,000,000 | 0.59 | 0.59 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 74,819 |


Non-Pooled Investments
As of June 30, 2016

| Type of Investment | CUSIP | Issue Name | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Duration | Coupon |  | Par Value |  | Book Value |  | Amortized Book Value |  |  | ket Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State/Local Agencies | 797712AD8 | SFRDA SOUTH BEACH HARBOR | 1/20/12 | 12/1/16 | 0.42 | 3.50 | \$ | 675,000 | \$ | 675,000 | \$ | 675,000 | \$ | \$ | 680,711 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  | 0.42 | 3.50 | \$ | 675,000 | \$ | 675,000 | \$ | 675,000 | \$ | + | 680,711 |
| Grand Totals |  |  |  |  | 0.42 | 3.50 | \$ | 675,000 | \$ | 675,000 | \$ | 675,000 | S | \$ | 680,711 |



## Memorandum

09.01.16
re:
Citizens Advisory Committee September 7, 2016
To: Citizens Advisory Committee
From: Eric Cordoba - Deputy Director for Capital Projects


Subject: INFORMATION - Major Capital Projects Update - Transbay Transit Center and Downtown Rail Extension

## Summary

The Transbay Transit Center and Downtown Extension (TTC/DTX) project, one of the signature Prop K projects, is being built in two phases: Phase 1 is the TTC building, bus ramp, and related improvements, and Phase 2 is the downtown extension of commuter rail service into the new TTC, accommodating both Caltrain and high-speed trains. On June 9, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) Board adopted the final revised budget for Phase 1 in the amount of $\$ 2.3$ billion. At that same meeting, staff presented a comprehensive Phase 2 update with a refreshed cost estimate. The TJPA Board directed staff to proceed with the work required to advance Phase 2 (see separate agenda item requesting Prop K funds). The 1.95 -mile rail extension will be constructed principally below grade using cut-and-cover and mined tunneling methods underneath Townsend and Second Streets. The design includes a new underground station at Fourth and Townsend Streets and six structures for emergency egress and ventilation along the alignment. The current estimate for Phase 2 (DTX) is $\$ 3.9$ billion. There is an aspirational open-for-use date of 2025 , which is predicated on securing funding in a timely manner and a construction period of seven years, starting in December 2018. The proposed funding plan includes Passenger Facility Charges that are subject to approval by the California High-Speed Rail Authority and Caltrain boards. Construction of Phase 1, the TTC, is well underway. As of the end of July, Phase 1 was $65 \%$ complete. Although at one time it appeared that completion was going to be three months late, the contractor has been successful in its recovery efforts and it now looks like construction will reach substantial completion on schedule and within budget. TJPA has started planning for the facility's commissioning, with bus service scheduled to begin in December 2017.

## BACKGROUND

Headed by the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA), the Rebuilt Transbay Terminal Program also known as the Transbay Transit Center/Caltrain Downtown Extension (TTC/DTX) consists of three interconnected elements: replacing the former outmoded terminal with a modern terminal; extending Caltrain from Fourth and King Streets to the new TTC at First and Mission Streets, with accommodations for future high-speed rail service; and creating a new transit-friendly neighborhood with 3,500 new homes in the Transbay Development Area ( $35 \%$ of which will be affordable) and mixed-use commercial development. TJPA was created in April 2001 by the City and County of San Francisco (City), the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board in order to design, build, operate and maintain the project. The TTC will be the northern terminus of the California high-speed rail corridor between San Francisco and Los Angeles. The project is being built in two phases: Phase 1 is the TTC building, bus ramp, and related improvements, and Phase 2 is the DTX, an underground BART/Muni pedestrian connector, extension of the TTC to accommodate an Intercity

Bus Facility, train box fit-out (Caltrain and high-speed rail station elements with the TTC train box) and related elements.

TJPA is well underway with Phase 1, but Phase 2 has been essentially on hold due to a significant funding gap. On June 9, the TJPA Board adopted the final revised budget for Phase 1 in the amount of $\$ 2,259,400,000$. At that same meeting, staff presented a comprehensive Phase 2 update with a refreshed Phase 2 cost estimate. The TJPA Board directed staff to proceed with the work required to advance Phase 2. Accordingly, a limited notice-to-proceed was issued to Parsons Transportation Group in June for continued preliminary engineering of the DTX. A Prop K sales tax allocation request for $\$ 6,774,400$ for the completion of this effort will be presented today as a separate agenda item.

TTC/DTX is the largest project in the Prop K Expenditure Plan, which designates up to $\$ 270$ million (in 2003 dollars) for this purpose. The Expenditure Plan specifies that the TTC and the DTX are to be built as a single integrated project. The total program budget is currently estimated at $\$ 6.1$ billion in year-ofexpenditure dollars.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) with a project delivery update focusing on Phase 2, the DTX and related elements. The DTX will extend Caltrain commuter rail from its current terminus at Fourth and King Streets and deliver California High-Speed Rail Authority's (CHSRA's) future high-speed rail service to the new TTC. The 1.95 -mile rail extension will be constructed principally below grade using cut-and-cover and mined tunneling methods underneath Townsend and Second streets. The design includes a new underground station at Fourth and Townsend streets and six structures for emergency egress and ventilation along the alignment. A detailed Scope of Work is included as Attachment 1. A report documenting the findings of a high-level project delivery options study was presented to the TJPA Citizens Advisory Committee and Board in July. The study reviewed both traditional and alternative project delivery options and evaluated which would best meet the needs of TJPA and stakeholders for delivering the Phase 2 infrastructure. Although, based on the report it appears that Design-Build would be the best delivery method, at least for the main contract, TJPA staff is going to wait until June 2017, when the current design effort will be complete, to make a recommendation on the delivery method.
Budget: The current estimate for Phase 2 is $\$ 3.9$ billion, up $\$ 900$ million from the 2013 cost estimate, mostly due to escalation, contingencies, and additional elements, such as the underground BART/MUNI pedestrian connector between Mission and Market Streets to the Embarcadero Station and turnback tracks The cost estimate is based on a refresh performed by the TJPA and its consultants and a cost review performed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). It is predicated on securing multiple sources of funding between 2017 and 2019 and a construction period of seven years, starting in December 2018. A new bottom-up estimate will be developed as part of the proposed effort by Parsons Transportation Group. It is scheduled for completion in May 2017. A more detailed version of the current cost estimate is included as Attachment 2.

| 2016 Phase 2 Cost Estimate | Cost (Millions) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Construction | \$1,504 |
| Design Contingency | \$211 |
| Subtotal Construction | \$1,715 |
| Escalation (5\%)* | \$583 |
| Construction Cost | 2,298 |
| Right of Way | \$266 |
| Programwide** (22.5\%) | \$517 |
| Program Cost | \$3,082 |
| Construction Contingency (10\%) | \$230 |
| Program Reserve (15\%) | \$462 |
| Subtotal Contingency and Reserve | \$692 |
| Total Program Cost | \$3,774 |
| BART Pedestrian Connector (\$110M direct cost $+\$ 51 \mathrm{M}$ escalation and contingency) | \$161 |
| Total Program Cost | \$3,935 |

*Escalation reflects a Revenue Service date of December 2025. If the project is delayed, TJPA estimates that the cost will increase an average of $\$ 217$ million per year.
**Reflects program-wide costs such as administration, management, legal, etc.
Funding: The table below shows the proposed funding plan, introduced to the TJPA Board at its June 9 meeting. It contains funding elements, such as a new San Francisco sales tax (e.g. proposed November 2016 Charter Amendment and/or amendment and extension of the current Prop K sales tax), Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts, regional contributions (anticipated bridge toll increase) and Passenger Facility Charges (PFC), that have yet to be committed. The PFC are preliminary numbers that are subject to approval by the CHSRA and Caltrain boards. PFCs were identified in the original 2004 Environmental Impact Statement/Report as a potential funding source. TJPA staff have had some exploratory discussions, but no material discussions with Caltrain and CHSRA staff have taken place yet.
The TJPA continues to work to identify additional funding sources and secure commitments for proposed sources. Plan Bay Area, the Regional Transportation Plan, includes the DTX as one of the region's top two priorities for New Starts funding, along with BART to San Jose. We are working with TJPA to reaffirm that commitment through the update of Plan Bay Area that is underway, an effort supported by the project's strong showing in MTC's Plan Bay Area project performance evaluation (i.e., it was a "high performer").

| Phase 2 Potential Funding (in \$ millions) | Total Funds | Net Proceeds after Debt Financing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Committed Transportation Authority Sales Tax (Prop K) | \$83 | \$83 |
| Committed San Mateo County Sales Tax | \$19 | \$19 |
| Committed MTC/BATA Bridge Tolls | \$7 | \$7 |
| Committed Regional Transportation Improvement Program | \$18 | \$18 |
| Transit Center District Plan-Mello Roos* | \$275-\$375 | \$275-\$375 |
| Tax Increment Residual (After TIFIA repayment) | \$665-\$735 | \$200-\$340 |
| FTA New Starts | \$650 | \$650 |
| New MTC/BATA Bridge Tolls | \$300 | \$300 |
| Future San Francisco Sales Tax or other local funds | \$350 | \$350 |
| Future California High-Speed Rail Funds | \$557 | \$557 |
| Land Sales (Block 4) | \$45 | \$45 |
| Passenger Facility Charges **or Maintenance Contribution | \$2,510-\$8,025 | \$865-\$1,920 |
| TOTAL POTENTIAL FUNDS | \$5,479-\$11,164 | \$3,369-\$4,664 |

* Range is based on different economic forecasts of the timing of development.
** Range reflects low and a high end testing of scenarios that vary the level of the PFCs.
Schedule: The DTX schedule shown below is aspirational. It is based on a goal to have the DTX ready to receive high-speed rail service when it comes up the Peninsula in 2025. The schedule is predicated on obtaining full funding by December 2019.

| DTX Delivery Schedule* |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Start | End |
| Approve Supplemental EIR |  | December 2016 |
| Complete Update of 30\% Design | July 2016 | May 2017 |
| Complete Development of Funding Plan |  | May 2017 |
| Select Delivery Method | July 2017 | December 2019 |
| Secure Funding | July 2017 | December 2019 |
| Property Acquisition | July 2017 | July 2019 |
| Complete Design and Bid Documents | July 2018 | December 2018 |
| Advertise and Award Advance Construction Packages | July 2019 | December 2019 |
| Advertise and Award Main Construction Package | July 2020 | December 2020 |
| Advertise and Award BART Connector and Other |  |  |
| Construction Packages |  |  |

*Schedule is based on traditional Design-Bid-Build delivery method
**Construction period includes early construction
Transit Center Building Status: Construction of Phase 1, the terminal building, is well underway. As of the end of July, Phase 1 was $65 \%$ complete. Although at one time it appeared that completion was going to be three months late, the contractor has been successful in its recovery efforts and it now looks like construction will reach substantial completion on schedule and within the revised budget. Structural concrete work will be completed in September 2016, together with the remainder of the miscellaneous steel. Work is progressing on the exterior awning and glazing in parallel with the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems. TJPA has started planning for the facility's commissioning by activating the commissioning team, which is reviewing submittals and commissioning plans for the various elements and engaging with the commissioning agent. Meetings are also taking place with the various transit agencies that will use the terminal to plan the start of operations. The Activation Plan for getting the building systems tested and running in order to be ready for tenants and the public, is scheduled for completion in January 2017. Bus Service is scheduled to start in December 2017.
Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)/Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Program: A DBE/SBE goal for the DTX has not been established yet. Over the life of the Program, TJPA has thus far achieved $9 \%$ DBE participation and $20 \%$ SBE participation in its contracting.

Challenges and Opportunities: The biggest challenge by far is funding. Work on Phase 2 has been on hold due to a significant funding gap. The proposed funding plan, although it has a series of major assumptions, presents a good framework for securing funding. The possibility for alternative project delivery options to enhance financing options and/or otherwise accelerate delivery, particularly in conjunction with related High Speed Rail opportunities in the corridor, also exists. The Transportation Authority, the City and County of San Francisco, and other funding partners are working with TJPA to advance strategies to secure the funding for Phase 2. Another issue is coordination with the Planning Department's Railyard, Alternatives, and I-280 Boulevard Feasibility Study (RAB), which is looking at potential alternative alignments for the Downtown Extension in the context of a comprehensive land use vision. The Planning Department anticipates releasing further findings and recommendations for next steps by the end of 2016.
Oversight Protocol: The TJPA and the Transportation Authority have agreed on an Oversight Protocol that will apply to both phases of the project. The protocol sets the framework for a partnership between the two agencies for the purpose of achieving the shared goal of on time and on budget delivery of a quality project for both the TTC and the DTX. The intent is to integrate the SFCTA Project Management Oversight representative (SFCTA PMO) into the TJPA Project Management Team's (TPMT) processes and protocols to serve as a resource to the team in addition to performing a traditional oversight role. The protocol is included as Attachment 3.

## ALTERNATIVES

None. This is an information item.

## FINANCIAL IMPACTS

None. This is an information item.

## RECOMMENDATION

None. This is an information item.

Attachments (3):

1. Phase 2 Scope Elements
2. Detailed Cost Estimate
3. Oversight Protocol

## Attachment 1: Phase 2 Scope Elements



The current Transbay Transit Center (TTC) Phase 2 project is comprised of the following elements:

1. Extension of the TTC Train Box to accommodate longer high-speed rail trains.
2. Extension of the Building between Beale and Main Streets to accommodate the Intercity Bus Facility.
3. Ventilation Shafts and Emergency Egress Structures (at 4th \& Townsend Street Station, 3rd \& Townsend Street, 2nd \& Harrison Street, and TTC).
4. Train Box Fit-Out (Caltrain and high-speed rail station elements within the TTC Train Box).

## Attachment 1: Phase 2 Scope Elements

5. BART Pedestrian Tunnel Connector.
6. Second Street Cut-and-Cover Throat Structure between Clementina Street and the TTC train box.
7. Mined tunnel between Townsend Street and Clementina Street.
8. Townsend Street Cut-and-Cover tunnel between Fourth Street and Second Street.
9. 4th and King Caltrain Yard.
10. Underground Fourth and Townsend Street Station.
11. Retaining wall and U-wall to approach underground 4th and Townsend Streets Station.
12. Tunnel Stub Box to accommodate future grade separation by Caltrain and high-speed rail.
13. Maintenance of Way and Turnback Track (within existing Caltrain right-of-way) south of Hooper Street.
14. Systems, including Overhead Contact Systems (OCS), Train Control, and Fire/Life/Safety and Communications are not shown, but are included in the Phase 2 scope together with utility relocations.

## Attachment 2 - Detailed Cost Estimate

2016 Phase 2 Cost Estimate (in year of expenditure dollars)

|  |  | Direct Costs | Design Contingency | Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase 2 Construction |  |  |  |  |
| DTX |  |  |  | \$1,467,777,900 |
|  | Segment 10 Fourth and King Surface Station and Yard Upgrade | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  | Segment 9 At Grade Trackway | \$707,000 |  | \$707,000 |
|  | Segment 8 U-Wall Segment | \$57,906,000 |  | \$57,906,000 |
|  | Segment 7 Cut and Cover West of Fifth St | \$92,220,000 |  | \$92,220,000 |
|  | Segment 6 Cut and Cover Fourth \& Townsend Underground Station | \$123,721,000 |  | \$123,721,000 |
|  | Segment 5 Cut and Cover East of Fourth St | \$82,069,000 |  | \$82,069,000 |
|  | Segment 4 NATM Mined Tunnel | \$387,981,000 |  | \$387,981,000 |
|  | Segment 3 Cut and Cover Throat Structure | \$151,037,000 |  | \$151,037,000 |
|  | Segment 2 Transit Center | \$889,000 |  | \$889,000 |
|  | Trackworks | \$82,775,000 |  | \$82,775,000 |
|  | Systems | \$92,662,000 |  | \$92,662,000 |
|  | Allowances | \$90,162,000 |  | \$90,162,000 |
|  | Design Contingency |  | \$199,551,900 | \$199,551,900 |
| Allowance for Properties Demolition |  | \$3,000,000 |  | \$3,000,000 |
| Tunnel Stub Box |  | \$99,876,000 | included | \$99,876,000 |
| DTX Vent Structures (heighting of structures) |  | \$3,222,000 | included | \$3,222,000 |
| Transit Center Building (TCB) |  |  |  | \$247,203,907 |
|  | Transit Center Fit Out | \$150,255,780 | \$7,512,576 | \$157,768,356 |
|  | Allowance for RVA for above at 5\% | \$7,512,789 |  | \$7,512,789 |
|  | Train Box Extension | \$55,631,840 | \$2,782,176 | \$58,414,016 |
|  | Allowance for RVA for above at 5\% | \$2,781,592 | \$514,738 | \$3,296,330 |
| IBF - PCPA 95\% CD Estimate item 2.3 plus 16.8\% for escalation to 2016 |  | \$12,582,864 | \$629,552 | \$13,212,416 |
| Allowance for IBF Escalator and Elevator from Beale street to Below Grade Train Box |  | \$5,000,000 |  | \$5,000,000 |
| Allowance for Main Street Utility Relocation |  | \$2,000,000 |  | \$2,000,000 |
|  | Subtotal DTX and TCB Construction excluding escalation | \$1,503,991,865 | \$210,990,942 | \$1,714,981,807 |
| DTX and TCB Construction Escalation at 5\% to mid construction (2023) |  |  |  | \$583,257,836 |
|  | Subtotal DTX and TCB Construction including escalation |  |  | \$2,298,239,643 |
| ROW** |  |  |  | \$266,200,000 |
| Programwide@ $22.5 \%$ of above excluding ROW |  |  |  | \$517,103,920 |
|  | Subtotal Program Costs |  |  | \$3,081,543,562 |
| Construction Contingency @ $10 \%$ |  |  |  | \$229,823,964 |
| Program Reserve@ $\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ of Subtotal Program Costs |  |  |  | \$462,231,534 |
|  | Total Program Cost excluding BART/Muni Pedestrian Connector |  |  | \$3,773,599,061 |
| BART/Muni Pedestrian Connector - Direct Construction Cost |  | \$109,525,767 | included | \$109,525,767 |
| BART/Muni Pedestrian Connector - Escalation |  |  |  | \$37,249,236 |
| BART/Muni Pedestrian Connector - Construction Contingency |  |  |  | \$14,677,500 |
|  | BART/Muni Pedestrian Connector Total Cost |  |  | \$161,452,503 |
|  | Total Program Cost including BART/Muni Pedestrian Connector | \$1,613,517,632 | \$210,990,942 | \$3,935,051,564 |

* Total Contingency/Reserves is $\$ 903$ million or $29.3 \%$ of Total Program Costs exclualing BART/Minii Pedestrian Connector
** ROW number was last updated with the 2013 Phase 2 cost estimate


## Attachment 3

## SFCTA OVERSIGHT PROTOCOL FOR

## THE TRANSBAY TRANSIT CENTER AND CALTRAIN DOWNTOWN EXTENSION

This oversight protocol sets the framework for a partnership between the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) for the purpose of achieving the shared goal of on time and on budget delivery of a quality project for both the Transbay Transit Center (TTC) and the Caltrain Downtown Extension (DTX). The intent is to integrate the SFCTA Project Management Oversight representative (SFCTA PMO) into the TJPA Project Management Team's (TPMT) processes and protocols to serve as a resource to the team in addition to performing a traditional oversight role. In order to add value to this partnership, the SFCTA agrees that its PMO will have the appropriate technical, project management skills, and background to perform its duties. All SFCTA costs related to the PMO services will be borne by the SFCTA.

1. The TJPA Project Management Team (TPMT) will have an open door policy and work closely with the SFCTA PMO, who will have access to project Section Managers and available information through TJPA staff. The SFCTA understands that some information will be confidential and commits to honor that confidentiality by not sharing or divulging any information so defined.
2. The SFCTA PMO will attend all appropriate progress meetings with the TPMT, to stay abreast of all project activities and when warranted, may also attend, as observer, partnering sessions and progress meetings with the contractor. The TPMT will provide a list of current and anticipated regularly scheduled meetings, and the SFCTA PMO and TPMT will jointly determine the meetings that would be most useful.
3. Subject to FTA and FRA concurrence, the SFCTA PMO will also attend meetings with the FTA and FRA and its PMOCs.
4. The TPMT will make available to the SFCTA PMO all project deliverables, reports, plans, procedures, and progress and cost reports for review and comment, which will be performed within the stipulated review period and submitted to the TPMT for consideration. Should the SFCTA PMO not provide comments by the due date, the TPMT may assume that they are not forthcoming.
5. The SFCTA PMO will review progress and cost reports and provide comments.
6. The SFCTA PMO will participate as an observer in consultant selection panels and proposal/bid reviews.
7. The SFCTA PMO will monitor quality through regular discussions with the TPMT and the TJPA Quality Assurance Manager.
8. The SFCTA PMO will be a member of the Risk Management team and participate in all Risk Management meetings and receive copies of the original risk register, its monthly updates, and reports.
9. For the DTX, the TPMT will institute a Configuration Management Board (CMB), with the SFCTA PMO as voting member, to review all proposed changes, regardless of whether they are owner, designer, or contractor originated, to determine merit, agree on quantum, and ultimately authorize all changes for the project. The SFCTA agrees that its PMO will have the appropriate technical and Project Management background and will not have veto power.

Recognizing that the TTC construction is well underway, and in lieu of establishing a new body for the TTC, voting participation by the SFCTA PMO in the existing change order review group will fulfil this requirement.
10. The SFCTA PMO will provide support to the TPMT on funding and financing issues, including proactively identifying grants and other funding opportunities.
11. The SFCTA PMO will review and approve project invoices submitted to the SFCTA and assure that they are processed in a timely manner.
12. The SFCTA PMO will assist the TPMT with development of grant amendments and funding requests which are submitted to the SFCTA for approval
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## Memorandum

To: Citizens Advisory Committee
From: Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming Oel
Subject: ACTION - Adopt a Motion of Support for Amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan and the Guideways - Muni 5-Year Prioritization Program

## Summary

The Prop K Expenditure Plan requires development of a Strategic Plan to guide the financial implementation of the program, and development of a 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) for each of the 21 programmatic categories as a prerequisite for allocation of funds. The purpose of the 5 YPPs is to provide transparency in how sponsors prioritize projects for Prop K funding, to establish a pipeline of projects that are ready to advance as soon as Prop K and other funds are available, and to encourage coordination across Prop K programs. In the summer of 2014, the Transportation Authority Board approved the Prop K 5YPPs for the 21 programmatic categories, including the Guideways - Muni category, for the period covering Fiscal Years (FY) 2014/15-2018/19. As approved the 5YPP included two projects with about $\$ 12$ million in Prop K funds and programmed $\$ 17$ million to a series of placeholders for yet-to-be-identified projects. The SFMTA has recently updated its Capital Improvement Program and has identified several guideways projects that are ready to advance during this 5YPP period. To make sufficient Prop $K$ funds available, the SFMTA has requested a comprehensive amendment to the Guideways - Muni 5YPP and a corresponding Prop K Strategic Plan amendment to advance $\$ 5,898,500$ in Prop K funds from FY 2033/34 to FY 2016/17, as well as reprogram $\$ 6.1$ million in FY 2018/19 Prop K funds from the New Backup Vehicle Control Center which is not going to advance in the next three years, to the priority projects shown in Attachment 2. The amendment would result in a minor $1.84 \%$ increase in financing costs in the Guideways - Muni category over the 30 -year life of the Prop K Expenditure Plan.

## BACKGROUND

The Prop K Expenditure Plan requires development of a Strategic Plan to guide the financial implementation of the program, and development of a 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) for each of the 21 programmatic categories (e.g. street resurfacing, new signals and signs, and traffic calming) as a prerequisite for allocation of funds. The Strategic Plan is the financial tool that guides the implementation of the Expenditure Plan, reconciling the timing of expected Prop K revenues with the schedule for availability of state, federal and other funds beyond Prop K, the Transportation Authority's debt issuance capacity, the Transportation Authority's own assessment of the deliverability schedule for proposed projects, and the costs associated with project escalation and debt financing.
The purpose of the 5YPPs is to provide transparency in how sponsors prioritize projects for Prop K funding, to establish a pipeline of projects that are ready to advance as soon as Prop K and other funds are available, and to encourage coordination across Prop K programs. Development of the 5YPPs is intended to be an open process where Transportation Authority Board members, public, and agencies
can meaningfully weigh in, particularly on the proposed programs of projects for the five year period. Each 5YPP includes a prioritization methodology to rank projects within the program, and a 5 -year project list with information on scope, schedule, cost and funding (including non-Prop K funding).
In the summer of 2014, the Transportation Authority Board approved the Prop K 5YPPs for 21 programmatic categories, including the Guideways - Muni category, for the period covering Fiscal Years (FY) 2014/15-2018/19. Projects eligible for the Guideways - Muni category include rehabilitation, upgrades and/or replacement of rail, overhead trolley wires, signals, and automatic train control systems. As requested by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the 2014 Guideways Muni 5YPP programmed a total of $\$ 29$ million of which $\$ 11.8$ million was for two specific projects and $\$ 17.2$ million in placeholders for projects to be identified later. Since then, the Board has amended the 5YPP twice and as of July 2016, the Board has allocated $\$ 10.9$ million in Prop K funds from this category. The 5YPP as amended is shown in Attachment 1.

The SFMTA has recently updated its Capital Improvement Program and has identified several guideways projects that are ready to advance during this 5YPP period. To make sufficient Prop K funds available, the SFMTA has requested a comprehensive amendment to the Guideways - Muni 5YPP and a corresponding Prop K Strategic Plan amendment to advance funding from the outer years of the Prop K program.

## DISCUSSION

The SFMTA has requested advancement of $\$ 5,898,500$ in Prop K funds in the Guideways - Muni category from FY 2033/34 (the last year in the program) to FY 2016/17 for priority projects identified in the SFMTA's 2016 Capital Improvement Program. Prop K funds would provide the required local match for funds expected from the Federal Transit Administration.
Table 1 below and Attachment 1 show the list of projects in the 2014 Guideways - Muni 5YPP and the status of the funds.

Table 1: Current Programming for the Guideways - Muni Category

| Project | Status | Prop K Amount |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Overhead System Rehab/ Replacement | Unallocated | $\$ 1,835,030$ |
| Rail Grinding | Allocated | $\$ 1,036,400$ |
| Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements | Allocated | $\$ 4,149,113$ |
| Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements | Unallocated | $\$ 3,550,887$ |
| Muni Metro Rail Replacement Program | Unallocated | $\$ 6,700,512$ |
| New Backup Vehicle Control Center | Unallocated | $\$ 6,091,537$ |
| Cable Car Infrastructure | Unallocated | $\$ 504,000$ |
| Van Ness Improvement | Allocated | $\$ 5,716,000$ |
| Total Funds Programmed |  | $\$ \mathbf{2 9 , 5 8 3 , 4 7 9}$ |
| Total Allocated to Date |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 9 0 1 , 5 1 3}$ |
| Total Remaining Programming |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 , 6 8 1 , 9 6 6}$ |

5YPP Amendment: The SFMTA has requested a 5YPP amendment to add the projects shown in Table 2 below and described in the attached Project Information Forms (Attachment 3), which provide information on project purpose and need, scope, schedule, cost and funding.

Table 2: Proposed New Programming for the Guideways - Muni Category

| Project | Prop K Amount |
| :--- | :---: |
| 33-Stanyan Overhead Contact System <br> Phase 2* | $\$ 1,365,500$ |
| Cable Car Propulsion Gearboxes | $\$ 1,280,000$ |
| Subway Replacement Wiring - Van Ness | $\$ 930,000$ |
| 19th Avenue M-Line Curved Track <br> Replacement | $\$ 1,323,000$ |
| Muni Metro System Replacements and <br> Upgrades | $\$ 1,000,000$ |
| Total Proposed New Programming | $\$ \mathbf{5 , 8 9 8 , 5 0 0}$ |

*A request for allocation is included in the Prop K grouped allocation request item later on this agenda.

This amendment would make a total of $\$ 35,481,979$ in Prop K funds available for Muni guideways projects in this 5YPP period.

The SFMTA has also requested reprogramming of $\$ 6,091,537$ from the New Backup Vehicle Control Center to the Overhead System Rehab/Replacement and the Muni Metro Rail Replacement Program. The New Backup Vehicle Control Center will advance after FY 2019/20 with Prop K programming available in the next 5YPP period.

Strategic Plan Amendment: Corresponding to the changes proposed to the 5YPP, this action would advance $\$ 5,898,500$ in Prop K funds in the Guideways - Muni category from FY 2033/34 to FY 2016/17, as well as reprogram funds and advance some of the cash flow from the New Backup Vehicle Control Center to other projects. The amendment would increase financing costs in the Guideways - Muni category by $1.84 \%$ from $3.94 \%$ to $5.78 \%$ over the 30 -year life of the Prop K Expenditure Plan.

The recommended programming and cash flow changes to the Guideways - Muni 5YPP and Strategic Plan have been evaluated in conjunction with proposed programming changes in three other Prop K categories: Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal, Caltrain Electrification, and New and Renovated Vehicles - Caltrain which are being considered under a separate agenda item). Together, these requested changes would advance a total of $\$ 12,298,500$ in Prop K funds from the outer years of the program to FY 2016/17, resulting in a minor increase of $\$ 5,637,494$ in finance costs to the Prop K program as a whole, which is a $0.19 \%$ increase in the amount of Prop K funds spent on financing over the life of the program. (See Attachment 4 for details.)

## ALTERNATIVES

1. Adopt a motion of support for amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan and the Guideways Muni 5-Year Prioritization Program, as requested.
2. Adopt a motion of support for the amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan and the Guideways -

Muni 5-Year Prioritization Program, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

## FINANCIAL IMPACTS

There is no impact on the Transportation Authority's annual budget associated with the recommendation action. However, the 5YPPs are an important financial planning document for the Transportation Authority as the 5YPPs establish the expected annual sales tax allocations and set maximum annual reimbursements. Actual allocation of funds is subject to separate approval action by the Transportation Authority. We will update the projected FY 2016/17 Prop K capital budget expenditures as part of a midyear budget amendment.

## RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a motion of support for amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan and the Guideways - Muni 5Year Prioritization Program.

Attachments (4):

1. Prop K 5-Year Project List, Guideways - Muni as amended July 26, 2016
2. Prop K 5-Year Project List, Guideways - Muni as proposed (current request)
3. Project Information Forms
4. Summary of Proposed Prop K Strategic Plan Amendment
Attachment 1. Prop K 5-Year Project List Guideways - Muni
Programming and Allocation

| Agency | Project Name | Phase | Status | Fiscal Year |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |  |
| SFMTA | Overhead System Rehab/Replacement | CON | Programmed |  |  | \$353,930 |  |  | \$353,930 |
| SFMTA | Overhead System <br> Rehab/Replacement | CON | Programmed |  |  |  |  | \$1,481,100 | \$1,481,100 |
| SFMTA | Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements ${ }^{2}$ | PS\&E/ CON | Allocated |  |  | \$4,149,113 |  |  | \$4,149,113 |
| SFMTA | Rail Grinding ${ }^{1}$ | CON | Allocated |  |  | \$1,036,400 |  |  | \$1,036,400 |
| SFMTA | Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements ${ }^{2}$ | PS\&E/ CON | Programmed |  |  |  | \$3,550,887 |  | \$3,550,887 |
| SFMTA | Muni Metro Rail Replacement Program ${ }^{2}$ | PS\&E/ CON | Programmed |  |  |  | \$176,493 | \$6,524,019 | \$6,700,512 |
| SFMTA | New Backup Vehicle Control Center | PS\&E | Programmed |  |  | \$704,000 |  |  | \$704,000 |
| SFMTA | New Backup Vehicle Control Center | CON | Programmed |  |  |  |  | \$5,387,537 | \$5,387,537 |
| SFMTA | Cable Car Infrastructure | PS\&E/ CON | Programmed |  |  |  | \$504,000 |  | \$504,000 |
| SFMTA | Van Ness Improvement ${ }^{2,3}$ | CON | Allocated |  |  | \$5,716,000 |  |  | \$5,716,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Programmed in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$11,959,443 | \$4,231,380 | \$13,392,656 | \$29,583,479 |
| Total Allocated and Pending in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,901,513 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,901,513 |
| Total Deobligated in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Unallocated in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,057,930 | \$4,231,380 | \$13,392,656 | \$18,681,966 |
| Total Programmed in 2014 Strategic Plan |  |  |  | \$0 | \$5,716,000 | \$5,680,012 | \$4,231,380 | \$13,392,656 | \$29,020,048 |
| Deobligated from Prior 5YPP Cycles ** |  |  |  | \$563,431 |  |  |  |  | \$563,431 |
| Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity |  |  |  | \$563,431 | \$6,279,431 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$0) |

[^6]60 Footnotes
${ }^{1}$ 5YPP Amendment to fund Rail Grinding (Res. 16-060, 06.28 .2016 ):
Muni Metro Rail Replacement Program: Reduced by $\$ 1,036,400$ in Fiscal Year 2016/17.
Rail Grinding: Added project with $\$ 1,036,400$ in Fiscal Year 2016/17 funds for construction.
${ }^{2}$ 5YPP Amendment to fund Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements (Res. 17-002, 07.26 .2016 ):
Muni Metro Rail Replacement Program: Reduced placeholders by $\$ 3,585,682$ in Fiscal Year 2016/17 and $\$ 3,550,887$ in Fiscal Year 2017/18.
Cumulative remaining programming capacity from funds deobligated from prior cycles: Reduced by $\$ 563,431$.
Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements: Added project with $\$ 4,149,113$ in FY 2016/17 and $\$ 3,550,887$ in FY 2017/18 for construction with $100 \%$ cash flow.
Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Overhead Component: Reduced cash flow by $\$ 3,081,388$ in Fiscal Year 2016/17 and $\$ 767,733$ in Fiscal Year 2017/18 and increased cash flow by same amount in Fiscal Year
2018/19. Project will not complete construction until Fiscal Year 2018/19. Shift in cash flow to accommodate the Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements.
${ }^{3}$ Van Ness Improvement (renamed from Van Ness BRT Overhead Component): $\$ 5,716,000$ programmed in FY 15/16 was allocated in FY $16 / 17$ (pending Res. 17-002, 07.26.2016).
Attachment 2. Prop K 5-Year Project List Guideways - Muni
Programming and Allocations to Date

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Year |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency | Project Name | Phase | Status | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |  |
| Programmed in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$17,153,943 | \$5,835,380 | \$12,492,656 | \$35,481,979 |
| Total Allocated and Pending in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$12,267,013 | \$0 | \$0 | \$12,267,013 |
| Total Deobligated in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Unallocated in 5YPP |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,886,930 | \$5,835,380 | \$12,492,656 | \$23,214,966 |
| Total Programmed in 2014 Strategic Plan |  |  |  | \$0 | \$5,716,000 | \$10,874,512 | \$5,835,380 | \$12,492,656 | \$34,918,548 |
| Deobligated from Prior 5YPP Cycles ** |  |  |  | \$563,431 |  |  |  |  | \$563,431 |
| Cumulative Remaining Programming Capacity |  |  |  | \$563,431 | \$6,279,431 | (\$0) | (\$0) | (\$0) | (\$0) |


\section*{| Programmed |
| :--- |
| Pending Allocation/Appropriation |
| Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation | <br> Footnotes}

${ }^{1}$ 5YPP Amendment to fund Rail Grinding (Res. 16-060, 06.28.2016):
Muni Metro Rail Replacement Program: Reduced by $\$ 1,036,400$ in Fiscal Year 2016/17.
Rail Grinding: Added project with $\$ 1,036,400$ in Fiscal Year 2016/17 funds for construction.
5YPP Amendment to fund Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements (Res. 17-002, 07.26.2016): 17 $\$ 3.550,887$ in Fisal Year
Cumulative remaining programming capacity from funds deobligated from prior cycles: Reduced by $\$ 563,431$.
Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements: Added project with $\$ 4,149,113$ in FY 2016/17 and $\$ 3,550,887$ in FY 2017/18 for construction with $100 \%$ cash flow.
Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Overhead Component: Reduced cash flow by $\$ 3,081,388$ in Fiscal Year 2016/17 and $\$ 767,733$ in Fiscal Year 2017/18 and increased cash flow by same amount in Fiscal Year 2018/19. Project will not complete construction until Fiscal Year 2018/19. Shift in cash flow to accommodate the Twin Peaks Tunnel Trackway Improvements.
${ }^{3}$ Van Ness Improvement (renamed from Van Ness BRT Overhead Component): $\$ 5,716,000$ programmed in FY 15/16 was allocated in FY 16/17 (Res. 17-002, 07.26.2016).

# Attachment 3 <br> Proposed Programming Guideways - Muni 5YPP Project Information Forms 



## Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

| Prop K Expenditure Plan Information |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Category: | A. Transit |
| Subcategory: | iii. System Maintenance and Renovation (transit) |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | c. 1 Guideways |
| EP Line (Primary): | 22 |
| Other EP Line Number/s: |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation: | 2016/17 |
| Project Information |  |
| Project Name: | Overhead System Rehab/Replacement |
| Project Location: | TBD |
| Project Supervisorial District(s): | TBD |
| Project Description: | Phased replacement of the overhead wires and related poles and traction power systems serving the light rail and trolley coach lines. Complements any overhead catenary system (OCS) work related to Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project (see separate Van Ness OCS project). |
| Purpose and Need: | The projects included in this program are designed to reduce operational problems, reduce maintenance and increase system reliability. |
| Community Engagement/Support: | N/A |
| Implementing Agency: | SFMTA - San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI) |
| Project Manager: | John Haley |
| Phone Number: | 415-701-4588 |
| Email: | John.Haley@sfmta.com |
| Environmental Clearance |  |
| Type: | N/A |
| Status: | N/A |
| Completion Date (Actual or Anticipated): | N/A |


| Project Delivery Milestones | Status | Work | Start Date |  | End Date |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | \% Complete | In-house - <br> Contracted - <br> Both | Quarter | Year | Quarter | Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering (30\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R/W Activities/Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advertise Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| End Construction (i.e. Open for Use) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Close-out |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments/Concerns

This is a placeholder for construction. Sufficient project detail and scoring of proposed project will be required when the allocation request is submitted.
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Project Cost Estimate |  |  | Funding Source |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | Cost |  | Prop K |  | Other |  |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$ | 1,160,000 |  |  | \$ | 1,160,000 |
| R/W | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Construction | \$ | 12,913,150 | \$ | 2,539,030 | \$ | 10,374,120 |
| Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Project Cost | \$ | 14,073,150 | \$ | 2,539,030 | \$ | 11,534,120 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  | 18\% |  | 82\% |

Project Expenditures (Cash Flow) By Fiscal Year
Comments/Concerns

| Prop K Expenditure Plan Information |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Category: | A. Transit |
| Subcategory: | iii. System Maintenance and Renovation (transit) |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | c. 1 Guideways |
| EP Line (Primary) | 22 |
| Other EP Line Number/s: |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation: | 2016/17 |
| Project Information |  |
| Project Name: | Muni Metro Rail Replacement Program |
| Project Location: | TBD |
| Project Supervisorial District(s): | TBD |
| Project Description: | Phased design and replacement of the trackway and related systems serving the light rail and streetcar lines as part of a regular replacement program and to mitigate excessive noise and/or vibration. |
| Purpose and Need: | The program seeks to enhance system reliability while reducing the need for excess maintenance. It also keeps the system in a state of good repair in line with agency strategic and operational goals. |
| Community Engagement/Support: | N/A |
| Implementing Agency: | SFMTA - San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI) |
| Project Manager: | John Haley |
| Phone Number: | 415-701-4588 |
| Email: | John.Haley@sfmta.com |
| Environmental Clearance |  |
| Type: | N/A |
| Status: | N/A |
| Completion Date (Actual or Anticipated): | N/A |


| Project Delivery Milestones | Status | Work | Start Date |  | End Date |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | \% Complete | In-house - <br> Contracted - <br> Both | Quarter | Year | Quarter | Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering (30\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R/W Activities/Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advertise Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| End Construction (i.e. Open for Use) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Close-out |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments/Concerns

This is a placeholder for design/construction in FY 16/17-18/19. Sufficient detail and a scoring of proposed project(s) will be required when the allocation request is submitted.


| Project Cost Estimate |  |  | Funding Source |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | Cost |  | Prop K |  | Other |  |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| R/W | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Construction | \$ | 93,927,763 | \$ | 18,888,049 | \$ | 75,039,714 |
| Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Project Cost | \$ | 93,927,763 | \$ | 18,888,049 | \$ | 75,039,714 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  | 20\% |  | 80\% |

Comments/Concerns

## San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Prop K Expenditure Plan Information |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Category: | A. Transit |
| Subcategory: | iii. System Maintenance and Renovation (transit) |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | c. 1 Guideways |
| EP Line (Primary): | 22 |
| Other EP Line Number/s: |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation: | 2017/18 |
| Project Information |  |
| Project Name: | Cable Car Infrastructure |
| Project Location: | Various |
| Project Supervisorial District(s): | 2, 3 |
| Project Description: | Replace and upgrade cable car infrastructure. Projects in this line item may include switch, electrical and track upgrades. |
| Purpose and Need: | Benefits range from remote operability, quicker response to outages (currently takes up to 1 hour to restore power), reliability, and improved safety with modern equipment (existing is antiquated). |
| Community Engagement/Support: | N/A |
| Implementing Agency: | SFMTA - San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI) |
| Project Manager: | Kenny Ngan |
| Phone Number: | 415-701-5489 |
| Email: | kenny.ng@sfmta.com |
| Environmental Clearance |  |
| Type: | N/A |
| Status: | N/A |
| Completion Date (Actual or Anticipated): | N/A |


| Project Delivery Milestones | Status | Work | Start Date |  | End Date |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | \% Complete | In-house - <br> Contracted - <br> Both | Quarter | Year | Quarter | Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering (30\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R/W Activities/Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advertise Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| End Construction (i.e. Open for Use) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Close-out |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments/Concerns

This is a placeholder for design/construction in FY 17/18. Sufficient detail and a scoring of proposed project(s) will be required when the allocation request is submitted.
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Project Name: |  |  |  |  |  | Cable Car In |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Cost Estimate |  |  |  | Funding |  | rce |
| Phase |  |  |  | Prop K |  | Other |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| R/W | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Construction | \$ | 7,500,000 | \$ | 1,404,000 | \$ | 6,096,000 |
| Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Project Cost | \$ | 7,500,000 | \$ | 1,404,000 | \$ | 6,096,000 |
| Percent of Total |  |  |  | 19\% |  | 81\% |



Comments/Concerns

San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Prop K Expenditure Plan Information |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Category: | A. Transit |
| Subcategory: | iii. System Maintenance and Renovation (transit) |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | c. 1 Guideways |
| EP Line (Primary): | 22 |
| Other EP Line Number/s: |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation: | 2016/17 |
| Project Information |  |
| Project Name: | Cable Car Propulsion Gearboxes |
| Project Location: | California, Hyde, Mason, Powell cable car lines |
| Project Supervisorial District(s): | 2, 3, 6 |
| Project Description: | Rehabilitate five cable car gearboxes for California, Hyde, Mason, Powell lines and one spare. The rehabilitation will consist of replacing wear and tear parts, inspecting and adjusting moving parts, and performing repairs as necessary, including: replacing bearings, gaskets, and seals; inspecting and replacing gears, housing, and shafts; and testing the gearboxes. <br> The spare gearbox is stored at the Burke Storage Facility at 1580 Burke St, SF. The other four gearboxes that are in operation are located in the Cable Car Barn at 1201 Mason St, SF. Please see the included drawing for the location of the four units within the Cable Car Barn. |
| Purpose and Need: | The project is designed to reduce operational problems, reduce maintenance, and increase system reliability with modern equipment. |
| Community Engagement/Support: | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Implementing Agency: | SFMTA - Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT) |
| Project Manager: | Robert Mau |
| Phone Number: | 701-4509 |
| Email: | robert.mau@sfmta.com |
| Environmental Clearance |  |
| Type: | Categorically Exempt |
| Status: | Pending |
| Completion Date (Actual or Anticipated): | 09/30/16 |


| Project Delivery Milestones | Status | Work | Start Date |  | End Date |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | \% Complete | In-house - <br> Contracted - <br> Both | Quarter | Fiscal Year | Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering (30\%) | 100\% | In-house | 3 | 2014 | 3 | 2016 |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) | 85\% | In-house | 3 | 2016 | 2 | 2017 |
| R/W Activities/Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advertise Construction | 0\% |  | 2 | 2017 |  |  |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract) | 0\% | Contracted | 3 | 2017 |  |  |
| End Construction (i.e. Open for Use) | 0\% | Contracted |  |  | 3 | 2019 |
| Start Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Close-out |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2020 |

## Comments/Concerns

Currently planning to advertise contract in November 2016.
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form


Comments/Concerns

San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Prop K Expenditure Plan Information |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Category: | A. Transit |
| Subcategory: | iii. System Maintenance and Renovation (transit) |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | c. 1 Guideways |
| EP Line (Primary): | 22 |
| Other EP Line Number/s: |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation: | 2016/17 |
| Project Information |  |
| Project Name: | Subway Replacement Wiring - Van Ness |
| Project Location: | Van Ness Muni Metro Station |
| Project Supervisorial District(s): | 5, 6 |
| Project Description: | Replace wireway, conduits, and cables at Van Ness platform signal equipment room to west of the wayside. The project will also add conduits and cables for four axle counters, seven signal lamps, and termination panels. Current wiring in this area has been compromised by water infiltration and rodent damage. This project will ensure greater reliability of power and signaling systems in the Van Ness crossover and stub track, improving subway service consistency. |
| Purpose and Need: | The program seeks to enhance system reliability while reducing the need for excess maintenance. It also keeps the system in a state of good repair in line with agency strategic and operational goals. |
| Community Engagement/Support: | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Implementing Agency: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) |
| Project Manager: | Kenny Ngan |
| Phone Number: | 701-5489 |
| Email: | kenny.ngan@sfmta.com |
| Environmental Clearance |  |
| Type: | Categorically exempt |
| Status: | Approved |
| Completion Date (Actual or Anticipated): | 04/01/16 |


| Project Delivery Milestones | Status | Work | Start Date |  | End Date |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | \% Complete | In-house - <br> Contracted - <br> Both | Quarter | Fiscal Year |  | | Quarter |
| :---: |

## Comments/Concerns

(8)


San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form

| Prop K Expenditure Plan Information |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Category: | A. Transit |
| Subcategory: | iii. System Maintenance and Renovation (transit) |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | c. 1 Guideways |
| EP Line (Primary): | 22 |
| Other EP Line Number/s: |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation: | 2016/17 |
| Project Information |  |
| Project Name: | 19th Avenue M-Line Curved Track Replacement |
| Project Location: | 19th Avenue at Rossmoor Drive and Junipero Serra Blvd. |
| Project Supervisorial District(s): | 7 |
| Project Description: | Replace curved tracks crossing 19th Avenue at Rossmoor Drive, including tangent track up to the north end of Stonestown Platform. This project will also replace two concrete Overhead Catenary System poles; construct accessibility upgrades at Rossmoor Drive; and implement additional safety, accessibility and transit improvements at 19th Avenue and Junipero Serra Boulevard. See attached for more project details. |
| Purpose and Need: | The program seeks to enhance system reliability while reducing the need for excess maintenance. It also keeps the system in a state of good repair in line with agency strategic and operational goals, as well as enhances safety and accessibility for those who use transit.. |
| Community Engagement/Support: | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Implementing Agency: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) |
| Project Manager: | Daniel Padilla |
| Phone Number: | 701-5213 |
| Email: | daniel.padilla@sfmta.com |
| Environmental Clearance |  |
| Type: | Categorically exempt |
| Status: | Pending |
| Completion Date (Actual or Anticipated): | 11/1/2016 (Signals CatEx approval completed. Track work CatEx expected in November 2016.) |


| Project Delivery Milestones | Status | Work | Start Date |  | End Date |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | \% Complete | In-house Contracted Both | Quarter | Fiscal Year | Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering (30\%) | 100\% | In-House | 3 | 2015 | 2 | 2016 |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) | 65\% | In-House | 2 | 2016 | 2 | 2017 |
| R/W Activities/Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advertise Construction | 0\% |  | 3 | 2017 | 3 | 2017 |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract) | $0 \%$ | Contracted | 3 | 2017 |  |  |
| End Construction (i.e. Open for Use) | 0\% | Contracted |  |  | 3 | 2018 |
| Start Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Close-out | 0\% |  |  |  | 3 | 2019 |

## Comments/Concerns



# San Francisco County Transportation Authority Proposition K Sales Tax Program Project Information Form 

| Prop K Expenditure Plan Information |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Category: | A. Transit |
| Subcategory: | iii. System Maintenance and Renovation (transit) |
| Prop K EP Project/Program: | c. 1 Guideways |
| EP Line (Primary): | 22 |
| Other EP Line Number/s: |  |
| Fiscal Year of Allocation: | 2016/17 |
| Project Information |  |
| Project Name: | Muni Metro System Replacements and Upgrades |
| Project Location: | Various |
| Project Supervisorial District(s): | Various |
| Project Description: | Phased replacement of the trackway and related systems (such as signals, track fasteners, circuit upgrades at substations, and other electrical and mechanical system improvements) serving the light rail and streetcar lines; replacement of the overhead wires and related poles and traction power systems serving the light rail and trolley coach lines; and modifications to the Automatic Train Control System software to integrate new crossovers that have been completed. |
| Purpose and Need: | The program seeks to enhance system reliability while reducing the need for excess maintenance. It also keeps the system in a state of good repair in line with agency strategic and operational goals. |
| Community Engagement/Support: | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Implementing Agency: | San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) |
| Project Manager: | John Haley |
| Phone Number: | 701-4588 |
| Email: | iohn.haley@sfmta.com |
| Environmental Clearance |  |
| Type: | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Status: | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Completion Date (Actual or Anticipated): | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |


| Project Delivery Milestones | Status | Work | Start Date |  | End Date |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | $\%$ Complete | In-house - <br> Contracted - <br> Both | Quarter | Fiscal Year | Quarter | Fiscal Year |
| Planning/Conceptual Engineering (30\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental Studies (PA\&ED) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering (PS\&E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R/W Activities/Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advertise Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start Construction (i.e. Award Contract) | $0 \%$ | Both |  |  |  |  |
| End Construction (i.e. Open for Use) | $0 \%$ | Both |  |  |  |  |
| Start Procurement (e.g. rolling stock) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Close-out |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments/Concerns

This is a placeholder for construction in FY17. Project details and scoring of proposed projects will be included when allocation request is submitted.

| Project Expenditures (Cash Flow) By Fiscal Year |  |  |  | Enter Cash Flow Here |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | Fund Source | Fund Source | Fiscal Year Funds Available | Previous |  | 14/15 |  | 15/16 |  | 16/17 |  | 17/18 | 18/19 |  |  |
| Construction | Prop K | Planned | 16/17 |  |  |  |  |  | s | 250,000 | s | 750,000 |  | s | 1,000,000 |
| Construction | FTA formula funds | Planned | 16/17 |  |  |  |  |  | s | 1,000,000 |  |  |  | s | 1,000,000 |
| Construction | FTA formula funds | Planned | 17/18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,000,000 |  | \$ | 3,00,000 |
| Total By Fiscal Year |  |  |  | s | s |  | \$ |  | s | 1,250,000 | s | 3,750,000 | s | s | 5,000,000 |
| Comments/Concerns |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EP } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | EP Line Item | Total Available Funds | Percent of Available Funds Spent on Financing | Total 30-year Pro | cost | ing \& Finance |  | V2016/17 |  | Fr2017/18 |  | Fr2018/19 |  | Fr2019/20 |  | FY2020/21 |  | Fr2021/22 |  | Fr2022/23 |  | Fr2023/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adopted 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan Amendment 5 (Approved) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5D <br> T | Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal | \$ 298,754,309 | 8.68\% | Programming | \$ | 223,176,073 | \$ | 1,343,948 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Finance costs Total | \$ | $\begin{array}{r}25,943,429 \\ \hline 249,119,502\end{array}$ | \$ | 104,341 $2,048,288$ | \$ | 2,657,479 2,657,479 | \$ | 1,935,427 | \$ | 1,598,262 | \$ | 3,192,915 $3,192,915$ | \$ | 2,760, 227 $2,760,727$ | \$ | $2,471,822$ $2,471,822$ | \$ | 1,986,154 |
| 6 | Electrification | \$ 25,765,517 | 15.25\% | Programming | \$ | 20,260,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | Finance Costs | \$ | 3,929,285 | \$ | 83,354 | \$ | 319,983 | \$ | 239,837 | \$ | 205, 122 | \$ | 427,140 | \$ | 388,659 | \$ | 370,936 | \$ | 324,054 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | \$ | 24,189,285 | \$ | 83,354 | \$ | 319,983 | \$ | 239,837 | \$ | 205,122 | \$ | 427,140 | \$ | 388,659 | \$ | 370,936 | \$ | 324,054 |
| 17P | New and Renovated Vehicles - PCJ PB | 25,465,305 | 7.66\% | Programming | \$ | 19,024,458 | \$ | 1,139,558 | \$ | 1,173, 745 | \$ | 1,208,957 | \$ | 1,295,226 | \$ | 1,332,583 | \$ | 1,371,060 | \$ | 1,410,692 | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | Finance Costs | \$ | 1,950,335 | \$ | 18,002 | \$ | 85,505 | \$ | 77,631 | \$ | 80,236 | \$ | 202,936 | \$ | 222,495 | \$ | 255,072 | \$ | 239,528 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | \$ | 20,974,793 | \$ | 1,157,560 | \$ | 1,259,250 | \$ | 1,286,588 | \$ | 1,375,462 | \$ | 1,535,519 | \$ | 1,593,555 | \$ | 1,665, 764 | \$ | 239,528 |
| 22M | Guideways - MUNI | \$ 308,337,545 | 3.94\% | Programming | \$ | 291,660,626 | \$ | 5,680,012 | \$ | 4,231,380 | \$ | 13,392,656 | \$ | 7,800,000 | \$ | 8,034,000 | \$ | 8,275,020 | \$ | 8,523,271 | \$ | 8,778,969 |
|  |  |  |  | Finance costs | \$ | 12,138,267 | \$ | 178,235 | \$ | 631,643 | \$ | 471,173 | \$ | 507,339 | \$ | 1,258,775 | \$ | 1,170,788 | \$ | 1,146,727 | \$ | 1,029,226 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | \$ | 303,798,893 | \$ | 5,858,247 | \$ | 4,863,023 | \$ | 13,863,829 | \$ | 8,307, 339 | \$ | 9,292,775 | \$ | 9,445,808 | \$ | 9,669,998 | \$ | 9,808,195 |
| TOTAL |  | \$ 658,322,675 | 6.68\% | Programming | \$ | 554,121,157 | \$ | 8,163,518 | \$ | 5,405,125 | \$ | 14,601,613 | \$ | 9,095,226 | \$ | 9,366,583 | \$ | 9,646,080 | \$ | 9,933,963 | \$ | 8,778,969 |
|  |  | Finance Costs |  | \$ | 43,961,315 | \$ | 983,932 | \$ | 3,694,611 | \$ | 2,724,067 | \$ | 2,390,959 | \$ | 5,081,766 | \$ | 4,542,669 | \$ | 4,244,558 | \$ | 3,578,962 |
|  |  | Total |  | \$ | 598,082,473 | \$ | 9,147,449 | \$ | 9,099,736 | \$ | 17,325,680 | \$ | 11,486,185 | \$ | 14,448,349 | \$ | 14,188,749 | \$ | 14,178,520 | \$ | 12,357,931 |


Proposed Amended Strategic Plan

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EP } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | EP Line Item | Total Available Funds | Percent of <br> Available Funds <br> Spent on <br> Financing |  | FY2024/25 |  | FY2025/26 |  | Fr2026/27 |  | FY2027/28 |  | FY2028/29 |  | FY2029/30 |  | FY2030/31 |  | Fr2031/32 |  | Fr2032/33 |  | Fr2033/34 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adopted 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan Amendment 5 (Approved) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 D | Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal | \$ 298,754,309 | 8.68\% | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 30,161, 173 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,522,761 | \$ | 1,153,477 | \$ | 857,641 | \$ | 438,855 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,522,761 | \$ | 1,153,477 | \$ | 857,641 | \$ | 438,855 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 30, 161, 173 |
| 6 | Electrification | \$ 25,765,517 | 15.25\% | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 278,115 | \$ | 248,550 | \$ | 245,084 | \$ | 217,085 | \$ | 191,115 | \$ | 164,606 | \$ | 123,896 | \$ | 74,116 | \$ | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 278,115 | \$ | 248,550 | \$ | 245,084 | \$ | 217,085 | \$ | 191,115 | \$ | 164,606 | \$ | 123,896 | \$ | 74,116 | \$ | - |  |  |
|  | New and Renovated Vehicles - PCJ PB | \$ 25,465,305 | 7.66\% | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 197,282 | \$ | 166,855 |  | 151,774 | \$ | 119,810 | \$ | 85,406 | \$ | 41,099 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 197,282 | \$ | 166,855 | \$ | 151,774 | \$ | 119,810 | \$ | 85,406 | \$ | 41,099 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |
| 22M | Guideways - MUNI | \$ 308,337,545 | 3.94\% | \$ | 9,042,338 | \$ | 9,313,608 | \$ | 9,593,016 | \$ | 9,880,807 | \$ | 10,177,231 | \$ | 10,482,548 | \$ | 10,797,024 | \$ | 11,120,935 | \$ | 11,454,563 | \$ | 11,798,200 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 914,167 | \$ | 849,303 | \$ | 866,464 | \$ | 820,660 | \$ | 765,258 | \$ | 669,086 | \$ | 505,061 | \$ | 297,903 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 9,956,505 | \$ | 10, 162,911 | \$ | 10,459,480 | \$ | 10,701,467 | \$ | 10,942,489 | \$ | 11,151,634 | \$ | 11,302,085 | \$ | 11,418,838 | \$ | 11,454,563 | \$ | 11,798,200 |
| TOTAL |  | \$ 658,322,675 | 6.68\% |  | 9,042,338 |  | 9,313,608 |  | 9,593,016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,912,326 | \$ | 2,418,185 | \$ | 2,120,963 | \$ | 1,596,410 | \$ | 1,041,779 | \$ | 874,792 | \$ | 628,957 | \$ | 372,019 | \$ | - | \$ | 41,959,373 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 11,954,664 | \$ | 11,731,793 | \$ | 11,713,979 | \$ | 11,477,217 | \$ | 11,219,010 | \$ | 11,357,339 | \$ | 11,425,981 | \$ | 11,492,954 | \$ | 11,454,563 | \$ | 41,959,373 |
| Proposed 2014 Prop K Strategic Plan Amendment 6 (Current request) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T | Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal | \$ 298,751,839 | 9.35\% | \$ | 40 | \$ | 1337878 | \$ | 106985 | \$ | 659273 | \$ | 191272 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 26,010,670 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,705,401 | \$ | 1,337,878 | \$ | 1,069,851 | \$ | 659,273 | \$ | 191,272 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Electrification | \$ 25,765,304 | 17.45\% | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 306,005 | \$ | 276,553 | \$ | 277,176 | \$ | 249,038 | \$ | 225,168 | \$ | 208,231 | \$ | 173,271 | \$ | 139,322 | \$ | 107,048 | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 306,005 | \$ | 276,553 | + | 277,176 | \$ | 249,038 | \$ | 225,168 | \$ | 208,231 | \$ | 173,271 | \$ | 139,322 | \$ | 107,048 | \$ | - |
| 17P | New and Renovated Vehicles - PCJ PB | \$ 25,465,094 | 8.63\% | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 204,255 | \$ | 173,760 | \$ | 159,710 | \$ | 127,408 | \$ | 93,627 | \$ | 52,294 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 204,255 | \$ | 173,760 | \$ | 159,710 | \$ | 127,408 | \$ | 93,627 | \$ | 52,294 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 22M | Guideways - MUNI | \$ 308,334,996 | 5.78\% | \$ | 9,042,338 | \$ | 9,313,608 | \$ | 9,593,016 | \$ | 9,880,807 | \$ | 10,177,231 | \$ | 10,482,548 | \$ | 10,797,024 | \$ | 11,120,935 | \$ | 11,454,563 | \$ | 5,899,700 |
|  |  |  |  | 5 | 1,174,599 | \$ | 1,112,788 | - | 1,168,644 | \$ | 1,130,747 | \$ | 1,099,067 | \$ | 1,078,433 | \$ | 977,296 | \$ | 929,295 | \$ | 1,233,308 | \$ | 49,473 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 10,216,937 | \$ | 10,426,396 | \$ | 10,761,660 | \$ | 11,011,554 | \$ | 11,276,298 | \$ | 11,560,981 | \$ | 11,774,320 | \$ | 12,050,230 | \$ | 12,687,871 | \$ | 5,949,172 |
| TOTAL |  | \$ 658,317,233 | 7.96\% | \$ | 9,042,338 | \$ | 9,313,608 | \$ | 9,593,016 | \$ | 9,880,807 | \$ | 10,177,231 | \$ | 10,482,548 | \$ | 10,797,024 | \$ | 11,120,935 | \$ | 11,454,563 | \$ | 31,910,370 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,390,260 | \$ | 2,900,980 | \$ | 2,675,382 | \$ | 2,166,466 | \$ | 1,609,135 | + | 1,338,958 | \$ | 1,150,566 | \$ | 1,068,617 | \$ | 1,340,356 | \$ | 49,473 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 12,432,598 | \$ | 12,214,587 | \$ | 12,268,398 | \$ | 12,047,272 | \$ | 11,786,365 | \$ | 11,821,506 | \$ | 11,947,591 | \$ | 12,189,552 | \$ | 12,794,919 | \$ | 31,959,842 |
| Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $(4,150,503)$ |
|  | Downtown Extension to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal | $(2,470)$ | 0.66\% | \$ | 182,640 | \$ | 184,401 | \$ | 212,210 | \$ | 220,418 | \$ | 191, 272 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | Transbay Terminal |  |  | \$ | 182,640 | \$ | 184,401 | \$ | 212,210 | \$ | 220,418 | \$ | 191, 272 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | (4,150,503) |
| 6 | Electrification | \$ (213) | 2.20\% | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 27,889 | \$ | 28,003 | \$ | 32,093 | \$ | 31,953 | \$ | 34,053 | \$ | 43,625 | \$ | 49,374 | \$ | 65,206 | \$ | 107,048 | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 27,889 | \$ | 28,003 | \$ | 32,093 | \$ | 31,953 | \$ | 34,053 | \$ | 43,625 | \$ | 49,374 | \$ | 65,206 | \$ | 107,048 | \$ | - |
| 17 P | New and Renovated Vehicles - PG PE | \$ (211) | 0.97\% | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 6,973 | \$ | 6,905 | \$ | 7,936 | \$ | 7,597 | \$ | 8,222 | \$ | 11,195 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 6,973 | \$ | 6,905 | \$ | 7,936 | + | 7,597 | \$ | 8,222 | \$ | 11,195 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 22M | Guideways - MUNI | \$ $(2,549)$ | 1.84\% | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | (5,898,500) |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 260,432 | \$ | 263,485 | \$ | 302,180 | + | 310,087 | \$ | 333,809 | \$ | 409,346 | \$ | 472,235 | \$ | 631,392 | \$ | 1,233,308 | \$ | 49,473 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 260,432 | \$ | 263,485 | \$ | 302,180 | \$ | 310,087 | \$ | 333,809 | \$ | 409,346 | \$ | 472,235 | \$ | 631,392 | \$ | 1,233,308 | \$ | $(5,849,027)$ |

Proposed Amended Strategic Plan
Pending September 2016 Board Action

Amendment 6 advances programming within the folllowing expenditure line categories: 5, 6, 17P, 22M. Please see the Prop K Allocation and the EP 22M Strategic Plan Update memos for more details.

## Memorandum

To: Citizens Advisory Committee
From: Anna LaForte - Deputy Director for Policy and Programming OKC
Subject: $\quad$ ACTION - Adopt a Motion of Support for Allocation of $\$ 20,888,900$ in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, for Fourteen Requests, Subject to the Attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules

## Summary

As summarized in Attachments 1 and 2, we have fourteen requests totaling $\$ 20,888,900$ in Prop K funds to present to the Citizens Advisory Committee. The Transbay Joint Powers Authority has requested $\$ 6.8$ million for preliminary engineering and cost estimate updates for the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX), a 1.3 mile tunnel connecting the new Transbay Transit Center with the current Caltrain terminus at Fourth and King Streets. The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain) has requested $\$ 3.9$ million for Electrification and $\$ 140,000$ for Communication Based Overlay System/Positive Train Control. Caltrain has also requested $\$ 5$ million in Prop K funds for San Francisco's Fiscal Year (FY) 2016/17 member contribution to the Caltrain capital budget for state of good repair projects, including the construction phase for retrofitting or replacing structural elements of the Marin and Napoleon Street bridges, mid-life overhauls for a small fleet of diesel locomotives that will be used post-electrification, and restroom renovations at the $4^{\text {th }}$ and King station. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency has requested funds for five projects: replacement of the overhead contact system (OCS) for the 33-Stanyan trolleybus line on $18^{\text {th }}$ Street between Castro and Mission ( $\$ 1.4 \mathrm{million}$ ); traffic signal upgrades at five intersections to facilitate the conversion of portions of Eddy and Ellis Streets to two-way operation ( $\$ 310,000$ ); implementation of traffic calming measures from four areawide traffic calming plans ( $\$ 1.5$ million); and installation of flashing beacons at seven intersections on WalkFirst high-injury corridors ( $\$ 399,000$ ). Approval of the requests for DTX, Electrification, and the Caltrain capital budget require amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan to advance funds to FY 2016/17. Approval of the 33-Stanyan OCS project is contingent upon approval of a 5-Year Prioritization Program and corresponding Prop K Strategic Plan amendment for the Muni Guideways category presented in the previous item on this agenda.

## BACKGROUND

We have received fourteen requests for a total of $\$ 20,888,900$ in Prop K funds to present to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) at its September 7, 2016 meeting, for potential Board approval on September 27, 2016. As shown in Attachment 1, the requests come from the following Prop K categories:

- Downtown Extension to Rebuilt Transbay Terminal
- Electrification
- Caltrain Capital Improvement Program
- Vehicles - Caltrain
- Facilities - Caltrain
- Facilities - Muni
- Guideways - Caltrain
- Guideways - Muni
- Signals \& Signs
- Traffic Calming

Transportation Authority Board adoption of a Prop K 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP) is a prerequisite for allocation of funds from programmatic categories.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this memorandum is to present fourteen Prop K requests totaling $\$ 20,888,900$ to the CAC and to seek a motion of support to allocate the funds as requested. Attachment 1 summarizes the requests, including information on proposed leveraging (i.e. stretching Prop K dollars further by matching them with other fund sources) compared with the leveraging assumptions in the Prop K Expenditure Plan. Attachment 2 provides a brief description of each project. A detailed scope, schedule, budget and funding plan for each project are included in the enclosed Allocation Request Forms.

Strategic Plan Amendment: Fully funding the requests for the Downtown Rail Extension, Electrification, and the Caltrain capital budget requires an amendment of the Prop K Strategic Plan to advance a total of $\$ 6,400,000$ in out-year programming to Fiscal Year (FY) 2016/17. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency has also requested a comprehensive amendment to the Muni Guideways 5-Year Prioritization and a corresponding amendment to the Prop K Strategic Plan to advance a total of $\$ 5,898,500$ from FY 2033/34 to FYs 2016/17-2018/19 for several projects, as discussed in a prior item on this agenda. Approval of the 33-Stanyan overhead contact system request is contingent on approval of that item.

Staff Recommendation: Attachment 3 summarizes the staff recommendations for the requests, highlighting special conditions and other items of interest.

Transportation Authority staff and project sponsors will attend the CAC meeting to provide brief presentations on some of the specific requests and to respond to any questions that the CAC may have.

## ALTERNATIVES

1. Adopt a motion of support for the allocation of $\$ 20,888,900$ in Prop K funds, with conditions, for fourteen requests, subject to the attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules, as requested.
2. Adopt a motion of support for the allocation of $\$ 20,888,900$ in Prop K funds, with conditions, for fourteen requests, subject to the attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules, with modifications.
3. Defer action, pending additional information or further staff analysis.

## FINANCIAL IMPACTS

This action would allocate $\$ 20,888,900$ in FY 2016/17 Prop K sales tax funds, with conditions, for fourteen requests. The allocations would be subject to the Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules
contained in the enclosed Allocation Request Forms.
Attachment 4, Prop K Allocation Summary - FY 2016/17, shows the total approved FY 2016/17 allocations and appropriations to date, with associated annual cash flow commitments as well as the recommended allocations and cash flows that are the subject of this memorandum. The impact of the proposed Prop K Strategic Plan amendment to advance a total of $\$ 12,298,500$ in Prop K funds for the aforementioned projects would be an estimated $\$ 5,637,494$ in additional financing costs, or a $0.19 \%$ increase in the percent of available funds spent on financing for the program as a whole, which we consider to be insignificant.

Sufficient funds are included in the adopted FY 2016/17 budget to accommodate the recommended actions. Furthermore, sufficient funds will be included in future budgets to cover the recommended cash flow distribution for those respective fiscal years.

## RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a motion of support for the allocation of $\$ 20,888,900$ in Prop K Funds, with conditions, for fourteen requests, subject to the attached Fiscal Year Cash Flow Distribution Schedules.

Attachments (4):

1. Summary of Applications Received
2. Project Descriptions
3. Staff Recommendations
4. Prop K Allocation Summary - FY 2016/17

Enclosures (2):
A. Prop K/Prop AA Allocation Request Forms (14)
B. Proposed Amended Strategic Plan


[^7]| EP Line No./ Category | Project <br> Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds Requested | Prop AA Funds Requested | Project Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | TJPA | Downtown Rail Extension | \$ 6,774,400 | \$ | Requested funds will be used for preliminary engineering and cost estimate updates for the Downtown Rail Extension (DTX), which is Phase 2 of the Transbay Transit Center (TTC) Program. Phase 2 includes a 1.3 mile tunnel connecting the new TTC with the current Caltrain terminus at Fourth and King Streets. The updated design work and cost estimates will include new elements of the project (such as an Intercity Bus Facility, an underground BART/Muni pedestrian connector and a tunnel stub to allow a potential future underground approach by high speed rail) and modified elements (e.g. relocation of the 4th and Townsend underground station from under the Caltrain yard to under Townsend Street to allow for potential future development of the yard). Bringing the DTX up to $30 \%$ design and updating the cost estimate will better position the project to secure funding. The current cost estimate for right-of-way and construction is $\$ 3.9$ billion. |

Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions ${ }^{1}$
Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions

| EP Line <br> No./ <br> Category | Project <br> Sponsor |  | Project Name |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EP Line } \\ \text { No./ } \\ \text { Category } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Project Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds Requested | Prop AA Funds Requested | Project Description |
| 20P | PCJPB | Station Enhancements and Renovations | \$ 436,462 | \$ | Funds will be used to keep Caltrain stations in a state of good repair. At the 4th and King Station, includes crew quarters and tower painting, restroom renovation, and a Station Building Corrosion Study and Plan. Project also includes installation of Emergency Electrical Transfer Switches at all San Francisco stations. Design is underway, with construction from Fall 2017 to Fall 2018. |
| 20M | SFMTA | Muni Metro East (MME) Phase 2 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ | Project will extend five existing tracks into the southwest corner of the Muni Metro East (MME) facility to provide additional storage space for the SFMTA's growing fleet of light rail vehicles (LRVs). The original MME Phase 2 scope included a new paint and body shop, a new LRV maintenance and mid-life overhaul facility, and historic streetcar canopy and storage tracks. The SFMTA has determined that LRV maintenance is best performed by the vehicle manufacturers, and that the Cameron Beach Yard would be a more strategic location to house and maintain the historic streetcars. The revised scope of work will extend the tracks into the space originally identified for the body repair and paint shop and later for the historics canopy. The design phase will primarily be done by SFMTA staff and be completed by March 2017. |
| 22P | PCJPB | Santa Clara Grade Crossing Medians | \$ 758,704 | \$ | Requested funds will be used to construct medians at six at-grade crossings along the Caltrain line in Santa Clara County, per Federal Transit Administration requirements. |
| 22P | PCJPB | Systemwide Track Rehabilitation | \$ 600,000 | \$ | Annual program to keep Caltrain's railroad in a state of good repair, including replacing rails and other track related components. Work will take place between October 2016 and Spring 2018. |

Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions ${ }^{1}$

| EP Line <br> No./ <br> Category | Project Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds Requested | Prop AA Funds Requested | Project Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22M | SFMTA | 33-Stanyan Overhead Contact System Phase 2 | \$ 1,365,500 | \$ | Requested funds will be used to replace the overhead contact system (OCS) for the 33-Stanyan trolleybus line on 18th Street between Castro and Mission Streets, including streetlight and traffic signal poles that support the OCS system. Curb ramps will be constructed at 18th and Lapidge, Oakwood, and Lexinton streets. Construction impacts include diesel bus substitution on six weekends, temporary bus stop relocation, and temporary parking reduction. Construction will begin in October 2016 and be open for use by December 2017. |
| 33 | SFMTA | Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement | \$ 310,000 | \$ | This project will upgrade traffic signals at five intersections to enable the conversion of Eddy (between Leavenworth and Mason) and Ellis (between Jones and Cyril Magnin) to two-way operation. The project will reduce vehicular speeds and increase pedestrian safety on these Vision Zero High Injury Corridors. The scope includes pedestrian countdown signals, two corner bulb-outs at Eddy/Leavenworth, and curb ramps at Ellis/Taylor. Construction will start in January and be completed by September 2017. |
| 38 | SFMTA | Traffic Calming Implementation (Prior Areawide Plans) | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ | This project will implement traffic calming measures recommended in the Dewey, Inner Sunset, North Bernal Heights, and Saint Francis Wood areawide traffic calming plans, including construction of seven bulbouts and one pedestrian refuge island, as well as two curb ramps on Herbst Road near the SF Zoo. Construction will occur in January through December 2017. These measures represent a portion of the traffic calming backlog of recommendations from previously completed areawide plans. In October 2016, SFMTA staff will be requesting another Prop K allocation for construction of the remaining backlog. |

## Attachment 2: Brief Project Descriptions ${ }^{1}$


Attachment 3: Staff Recommendations ${ }^{1}$

| EP Line No./ Category | Project <br> Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds <br> Recommended | Prop AA Funds <br> Recommended | Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | TJPA | Downtown Rail Extension | \$ 6,774,400 | \$ | Strategic Plan Amendment: The recommended allocation is contingent upon a Prop K Strategic Plan amendment to the Caltrain Downtown Extension (DTX) to a Rebuilt Transbay Terminal category. The amendment would advance $\$ 4,150,503$ programmed for the DTX in FY 2033/34 and $\$ 645,095$ in cash flow from FY 2017/18 to FY 2016/17. It also requires an exception to the Strategic Plan policy setting aside all remaining funds not already programmed to Phase 1 for Phase 2 (DTX) construction. See attached Strategic Plan amendment for details. <br> The recommendation also includes the condition that the TJPA agrees to the attached oversight protocol for Phases 1 and Phase 2. TJPA has agreed to the oversight protocol. |
| 6 | PCJPB | Caltrain Early Investment Program <br> - Electrification | \$ 3,900,000 | \$ | Strategic Plan Amendment: The recommended allocation is contingent upon a Prop K Strategic Plan amendment to program $\$ 640,000$ of unprogrammed capacity in the Prop K Caltrain Electrification category in FY 2016/17. <br> The recommendation is also contingent upon a Caltrain staff commitment to continued compliance with the Funding Partners Oversight Protocol for Caltrain's Cal Mod Program (attached to the Allocation Request Form). |
| 6 | PCJPB | Caltrain Early Investment Program - CBOSS | \$ 140,000 | \$ - | The recommendation is contingent upon a Caltrain staff commitment to continued compliance with the Funding Partners Oversight Protocol for Caltrain's Cal Mod Program (attached to the Allocation Request Form). |
| 7 | PCJPB | Los Gatos Creek Bridge Replacement | \$ 895,729 | \$ |  |
| 7 | PCJPB | Marin Street and Napoleon Street Bridges | \$ 200,000 | \$ |  |
| 17P | PCJPB | F-40 Mid Life Overhaul | \$ 2,109,105 | \$ - | Strategic Plan Amendment: Approval of this request is contingent upon a Strategic Plan amendment to advance \$969,547 in programming from FY 22/23 to FY 16/17. See attached Strategic Plan amendment for details. |
| 20P | PCJPB | Station Enhancements and Renovations | \$ 436,462 | \$ - |  |

Attachment 3: Staff Recommendations ${ }^{1}$

| EP Line <br> No./ <br> Category | Project <br> Sponsor | Project Name | Prop K Funds <br> Recommended |  |  |  | Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20M | SFMTA | Muni Metro East (MME) Phase 2 | \$ | 1,500,000 | \$ | - |  |
| 22P | РСЈРВ | Santa Clara Grade Crossing Medians | \$ | 758,704 | \$ | - |  |
| 22P | PCJPB | Systemwide Track Rehabilitation | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | - |  |
| 22M | SFMTA | 33-Stanyan Overhead Contact System Phase 2 | \$ | 1,365,500 | \$ |  | The recommended allocation is contingent upon approval of a comprehensive 5YPP amendment and corresponding Strategic Plan amendment to the Muni Guideways category to advance $\$ 5,898,500$ in programming from FY 2033/34 to FYs 2016/17-2018/19 for various projects. These amendments are the subject of a previous item on this agenda. |
| 33 | SFMTA | Eddy and Ellis Traffic Calming Improvement | \$ | 310,000 | \$ |  | 5YPP Amendment: The recommended allocation is contingent upon a 5 YPP amendment to the Signals and Signs category to reprogram $\$ 167,729$ from the Gough Corridor Signal Upgrade design phase, which is fully funded, to the subject project. See attached 5YPP amendment for details. |
| 38 | SFMTA | Traffic Calming Implementation (Prior Areawide Plans) | \$ | 1,500,000 | \$ | - |  |
| 38 | SFMTA | WalkFirst Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons | \$ | 399,000 | \$ |  | 5YPP Amendment: The recommended allocation is contingent upon a 5 YPP amendment to program $\$ 399,000$ in deobligated funds from projects completed under budget, to this project. See attached 5YPP amendment for details. |
|  |  | TOTAL | \$ | 20,888,900 | \$ | - |  |

[^8]Prop K Allocation Summary - FY 2016/17

| PROP K SALES TAX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CASH FLOW |  |  |
|  | Total |  | FY 2016/17 |  | FY 2017/18 |  | FY 2018/19 |  | FY 2019/20 |  | FY 2020/21 |  |
| Prior Allocations | \$ | 51,496,707 | \$ | 30,187,798 | \$ | 12,162,933 | \$ | 9,145,976 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Current Request(s) | \$ | 20,888,900 | \$ | 15,677,907 | \$ | 5,210,993 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| New Total Allocations | \$ | 72,385,607 | \$ | 45,865,705 | \$ | 17,373,926 | \$ | 9,145,976 | \$ | - | \$ | - |

The above table shows maximum annual cash flow for all FY 2015/16 allocations approved to date, along with the current recommended

Investment Commitments, per Prop K Expenditure Plan


Prop K Investments To Date



[^0]:    cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Aimee Brown, Ron Gerhard, Reeta Madhavan, Charles Perl
    Ben Rosenfield, Controller, Office of the Controller
    Tonia Lediju, Internal Audit, Office of the Controller
    Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance \& Administration, San Francisco County Transportation Authority
    Carol Lu, Budget Analyst
    San Francisco Public Library
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    | Board Approved Allocation/Appropriation |

[^7]:    Footnotes
    "EP Line
    
    ${ }^{2}$ Acronyms: PCJPB (Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board or Caltrain), SFMTA (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency), TJPA (Transbay Joint Powers Authority)
    
     cover $90 \%$ of the total costs for all projects in that category, and Prop K should cover only $10 \%$.
    
     project that is well leveraged overall may have lower-than-expected leveraging for an individual or partial phase.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Attachment 1 for footnotes.

